

v/o 13

# The American Historical Review

## Board of Editors

GEORGE B. ADAMS

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART

WILLIAM M. SLOANE

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

H. MORSE STEPHENS

## Managing Editor

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN

VOL. VIII No. 1

OCTOBER 1902

## ISSUED QUARTERLY

## CONTENTS

ELEANOR FERRIS	The Financial Relations of the Knights Templars to the English Crown.	1
A. H. CARPENTER	Habeas Corpus in the Colonies.	18
WORTHINGTON C. FORD	John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine, II.	28
CARL R. FISH	Lincoln and the Patronage.	53
DOCUMENTS—	English Policy Toward America in 1790-1791, II; Two Letters of Richard Cromwell, 1659; A Letter of Marquis de La Fayette, 1781; A Letter of Alexander H. Stephens, 1854.	78
REVIEWS OF BOOKS—	Grundy's <i>The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries</i> ; Henderson's <i>A Short History of Germany</i> ; Jenks's <i>Edward Plantagenet</i> ; Coville's <i>Les Premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans</i> ; Kingsford's <i>Henry V.</i> ; Brown's <i>History of Scotland</i> , II.; Adams's <i>Lee at Appomattox and other Papers</i> ; Burgess's <i>Reconstruction and the Constitution</i> ; Boutmy's <i>Éléments d'une Psychologie Politique du Peuple Américain</i> ; and other reviews.	98

(For a complete list of reviews see next page.)

## NOTES AND NEWS

## THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

41 NORTH QUEEN ST., LANCASTER, PA.

66 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.



# SHORTER CONTRIBUTIONS

Fred M. Fling, <i>The Authorship of the Journal d'Adrien Duquesnoy</i> . . . . .	70
--	----

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Grundy, <i>The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries</i> , by Dr. H. A. Sill . . . . .	98
Kaerst, <i>Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters</i> , I., by Professor Bernadotte Perrin . . . . .	100
Rainy, <i>The Ancient Catholic Church</i> , by Professor J. W. Platner . . . . .	103
Glover, <i>Life and Letters in the Fourth Century</i> , by the same . . . . .	105
Breysig, <i>Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit</i> , II., by Dr. Clive Day . . . . .	107
Hodgson, <i>The Early History of Venice</i> , by W. R. Thayer . . . . .	109
Henderson, <i>A Short History of Germany</i> , by Dr. Ferdinand Schwill . . . . .	110
Hassall, <i>The French People</i> , by Professor F. M. Warren . . . . .	113
Villari, <i>The Two First Centuries of Florentine History</i> , by Professor Merrick Whitcomb . . . . .	114
Miller, <i>Mediæval Rome, from Hildebrand to Clement VIII.</i> , by Professor A. B. White . . . . .	116
Jenks, <i>Edward Plantagenet</i> , by Dr. G. E. Howard . . . . .	117
Coville, <i>Les Premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans</i> , by Dr. J. W. Thompson . . . . .	119
Kingsford, <i>Henry V.</i> , by Professor E. P. Cheyney . . . . .	121
Toutey, <i>Charles le Téméraire et la Ligue de Constance</i> , by Professor G. L. Burr . . . . .	123
Einstein, <i>The Italian Renaissance in England</i> , by Professor S. B. Harding . . . . .	124
Cowan, <i>Mary Queen of Scots and Who Wrote the Casket Letters</i> , by W. F. Tilton . . . . .	126
Brown, <i>History of Scotland</i> , II., by Dr. G. T. Lapsley . . . . .	128
Taunton, <i>The History of the Jesuits in England</i> , by Dr. A. L. Cross . . . . .	130
Kovalevsky, <i>Russian Political Institutions</i> ; and Morfill, <i>History of Russia</i> , by Professor A. C. Coolidge . . . . .	131
Blauvelt, <i>The Development of Cabinet Government in England</i> , by Professor T. F. Moran . . . . .	134
Hanna, <i>The Scotch Irish</i> , by Professor S. M. Jackson . . . . .	136
Funck-Brentano, <i>The Diamond Necklace</i> , and <i>La Morte de la Reine</i> , by Professor C. D. Hazen . . . . .	137
Hosmer, <i>The History of the Louisiana Purchase</i> , by Professor D. Y. Thomas . . . . .	140
Harris, <i>The Sectional Struggle</i> , by Professor T. C. Smith . . . . .	141
Blackmar, <i>The Life of Charles Robinson</i> , by Professor L. W. Spring . . . . .	142
Adams, <i>Lee at Appomattox and other Papers</i> , by Hon. D. H. Chamberlain . . . . .	144
Ellicott, <i>The Life of John Ancrum Winslow</i> , by Admiral G. E. Belknap . . . . .	147
Burgess, <i>Reconstruction and the Constitution</i> , by W. G. Brown . . . . .	150
Boutmy, <i>Éléments d'une Psychologie Politique du Peuple Américain</i> , by Professor A. L. Lowell . . . . .	152
Brinkley, <i>Japan: Its History, Arts and Literature</i> , by Dr. W. E. Griffis . . . . .	154
MINOR NOTICES . . . . .	156

*The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW to all its members; the Executive Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.*

*Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW may be sent to the Managing Editor, Professor A. C. McLaughlin, 836 Tappan Street, Ann Arbor, Mich., or to the Board of Editors. Books for review may be sent to the Managing Editor, in care of The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa., or 66 Fifth Ave., New York. The price of subscription, to persons who are not members of the American Historical Association, is four dollars a year; single numbers are sold for one dollar; bound volumes may be obtained for four dollars and a half. Back numbers or volumes of the REVIEW may be obtained at the same rates.*

COPYRIGHT, 1902, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

THE NEW ERA PRINT,  
LANCASTER, PA.

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE FINANCIAL RELATIONS OF THE KNIGHTS  
TEMPLARS TO THE ENGLISH CROWN<sup>1</sup>

THE order of the Knights Templars is familiar to all readers of the history or romance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for its courage, military prowess, wealth, and somewhat arrogant pride. The Templars together with the Knights of the Hospital of St. John long formed the most stable element in the Holy Land and their military services there have received full recognition. But the order also rendered important services to Christendom in a very different field of action. In the unwarlike atmosphere of the counting-room, the soldiers of the Temple, for over a century, handled much of the capital of western Europe, becoming expert accountants, judicious administrators, and pioneers in that development of credit and its instruments, which was destined to revolutionize the methods of commerce and finance. This civil aspect of the Knights Templars is comparatively little known. The custom of storing treasure at the New Temple in London is described and illustrated by Mr. Addison whose history of the order appeared in 1842.<sup>2</sup> Professor Cunningham, in the third edition of his *Growth*

<sup>1</sup> The following contractions are used in the foot-notes that follow :

Bond is the abbreviated reference to *Extracts from the Liberate Rolls*, by E. A. Bond *Archæologia*, XXVIII. London, 1840.

Delisle is for "Mémoire sur les Opérations Financières des Templiers. Mémoires de l'Institut National de France." *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XXXIII. Paris, 1888.

R. C. is for Record Commission.

*Rot. Claus.* is for *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum*, 1204-1227. Ed. T. D. Hardy. Record Commission. 2 vols. London, 1833-1844.

*Rot. Pat.* is for *Rotuli Litterarum Patentium*, 1201-1216. Ed. T. D. Hardy. Record Commission. London, 1835.

R. S. is for "Rolls Series."

Rymer is for *Federa*, ed. Thomas Rymer. Record Commission, 4 vols. London, 1816-1869.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Knights Templars*, pp. 122-125.



of *English Industry and Commerce*, has credited the Templars with a share in the financial operations of the thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> In 1889, M. Léopold Delisle made "Les Opérations Financières des Templiers" the subject of a *mémoire* before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,<sup>2</sup> in which, after illustrating the employment of the order in financial affairs by the popes and by many of the princes, prelates, and magnates of western Europe, he has dealt exhaustively with the financial relations between the French kings and the Templars. It is the object of the present study to set forth, as precisely as may be, the exact nature and extent of the financial relations between the Templars and the English Crown. The subject is deserving of investigation both because of the slight contribution it may yield to the fiscal history of England in the thirteenth century, and because the civil services which the order had long been rendering at the time of its dissolution ought to be taken into account in a final estimate of its place in history.

Every financial transaction is a matter of receipt or disbursement according to the point of view. If one take one's stand in the Temple treasury in London, the relations of the order with the outside world resolve themselves, so far as money is concerned, into these two general classes. Under receipt the Temple is to be considered as a place of safe-deposit for those who had valuable possessions and as a royal treasury where funds were stored and taxes paid in. The outlook is towards the exchequer at Westminster where the fiscal system of the realm centered, and beyond to the various sources from which the king's revenue was derived. Under the second head of disbursements the relations to be examined are more directly with the king. In addition to loans and payments made at the king's order, are to be considered some more complex banking operations, in the development of which the Templars were, in M. Delisle's opinion, the rivals, if not the precursors, of the Italian societies of merchants.

The fact of any connection between the order of soldier monks, devoted to the rescue and defense of the holy sepulchre, and the financial affairs of Christendom is to be accounted for, possibly, by the common medieval practice of depositing objects of value in consecrated places for security during times of trouble and tumult. In addition to the spiritual protection of a hallowed spot, the houses of the Templars possessed the great practical advantages of having been built by men who were excellent engineers and of being defended by the bravest soldiers of the age.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 274.

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France*, XXXIII.

<sup>3</sup> Delisle, p. 2.



To speak only of England, all classes of persons who possessed treasure seem, during the thirteenth century, to have availed themselves of the New Temple<sup>1</sup> for purposes of what would to-day be called safe-deposit. In the absence of any records kept by the Templars, there is evidence of this custom of storing gold, silver, jewels, and the like at the Temple on the part of individuals only when circumstances happened to give publicity to the fact. Many thirteenth century chroniclers record such deposits incidentally in narrating the story of their sequestration or confiscation. This was the case with the 40,000 marks entrusted to the Templars by Falkes de Breauté, the Norman adventurer who had served John but fell into conspiracy and rebellion against the government of Henry III. In 1226, the masters of the order in both France and England were directed to sequester this sum as an indemnity for his depredations.<sup>2</sup> So also it appears that Hubert de Burgh had deposited his treasure at the New Temple, since Henry III. confiscated it there in 1232.<sup>3</sup> The departing Poitevins left a large sum at the Temple when they were forced to leave England in 1258.<sup>4</sup> Five years later, Edward, the heir to the throne, seized £10,000 which had been deposited at the Temple by the merchants and magnates of the land.<sup>5</sup> In 1278, the bishop of Rochester's chest was sequestered at the Temple on the ground of debt.<sup>6</sup> Just before the downfall of the order, Edward II. seized and gave to Piers Gaveston £50,000 which had been placed in the custody of the Templars by Bishop Langton, his father's treasurer.<sup>7</sup> Thus, justly or unjustly, the thirteenth century kings of England, from time to time, replenished their funds by confiscating the treasure entrusted to the Templars. These unfortunate depositors are doubtless but a small proportion of the many, whose treasures, safely guarded and restored intact, were unrecorded in the annals of the time.

<sup>1</sup> "About the beginning of Henry the Second's reign, the Knights Templars, leaving their home in Holburne, situate on the south part of that street where Southampton House lately stood, . . . did, for their more conveniency, set up another habitation for themselves over against the end of a street heretofore called New Street but now Chancery Lane; which had thereupon the name of the New Temple and contained all that space of ground from the White Fryers westwards unto Essex House, without Temple Barr."—Dugdale, *Originale Juridicales*, 144.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, II. 214.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), III. 232; Roger of Wendover (R. S.), III. 41; *Calendar of Documents rel. to Scotland* (ed. J. Bain), I. No. 1163.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), V. 704; Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (fourth edition), II. 81.

<sup>5</sup> *Annales Monastici* (R. S.), III. 222; Gervase of Canterbury (R. S.), II. 222; Sharpe, *London and the Kingdom*, I. 94.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1272-1279*, pp. 446-447.

<sup>7</sup> Walter of Hemingburgh (Eng. Hist. Soc.), II. 273; Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 335.

The Temple was also, quite naturally, used as a place of deposit for papal subsidies,<sup>1</sup> and for bequests and grants in aid of the Holy Land. Notices in the records of the period from Henry II.'s reign to that of Edward II. furnish abundant evidence that this was the usual practice.<sup>2</sup> Thus the custom of storing treasure at the New Temple may be regarded as established by the beginning of the thirteenth century. There were deposited the wealth of the magnates of the land, lay and ecclesiastical, the surplus capital of the merchants, and the papal subsidies.

By far the largest depositors on the books of the Templars were doubtless the English kings who regularly made use of the Temple as one of the royal treasuries. "It is to be understood," says Madox, "that the king had several treasuries, for though the receipt of the Exchequer was the principal place where his treasure was paid in, yet it was sometimes paid and deposited, at least for the present, in the king's wardrobe, in the Tower of London, and in the New Temple at London."<sup>3</sup> An early notice of this use of the New Temple occurs in a fragment of an exchequer receipt roll for the year 1185. From this it appears that the exchequer was at Westminster. From funds received there, the treasury at Winchester was replenished, while the balance was deposited in the Temple. This was at the Michaelmas term. An accountant who appeared in the following February paid in his money directly at the Temple.<sup>4</sup> King John deposited the crown jewels and important records in the Temple, as well as money; in 1215, for example, the account of a secret agreement between John and his sister-in-law, Berengaria, was placed in the New Temple.<sup>5</sup> Under Henry III. and Edward I., the Temple continued to serve as a royal treasury. In 1220, the papal nuncio, Master Pandulf, then an important factor in the English government, wrote to the treasurer and vice-chancellor to deposit the money in hand at the house of the Temple.<sup>6</sup> In 1276, Ed-

<sup>1</sup> In 1214, the papal legate was entertained at the New Temple for three days at a cost to King John of £6 19s. 5d. *Rot. Claus.*, I. 175. See also Matthew Paris (*R. S.*), IV. 557.

<sup>2</sup> Henry II. in his will of 1182 provided that a bequest for the Holy Land should be entrusted to the Templars. Rymer, I. 47. Almost a century later, Richard of Cornwall's bequest for the same object was deposited with them. *Compilation de Bérard de Naples*, cited by Delisle, 29, 109. Subsidies for the Holy Land were to be deposited at the Temple in 1286. *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1281-1292, pp. 231, 244; in 1291, Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 271, note G; and in 1300, Bond, 215. See also *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1301-1307, pp. 27, 63, 234; and *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, I. 343.

<sup>3</sup> Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 267.

<sup>4</sup> *Receipt Roll of the Exchequer for Michaelmas Term*, 1185, pp. vi, 31.

<sup>5</sup> Rymer, I. 126; *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies* (ed. M. A. E. Wood), I. 31. For other examples in John's reign, see *Rot. Pat.*, 48, 54, 51, 58, 131, 134; *Calendar of Documents rel. to Ireland* (*R. S.*), I. No. 541.

<sup>6</sup> *Letters, Henry III.* (*R. S.*), I. 113; see also pp. 118-120.

ward I. had a deposit at the Temple from which he withdrew 1,000 marks.<sup>1</sup> Many texts of the thirteenth century record the paying in or actual receipt at the Temple of various specific kinds of taxes, such as aids,<sup>2</sup> carucage,<sup>3</sup> fractional grants of movables,<sup>4</sup> tallage of London<sup>5</sup> and of the Jews,<sup>6</sup> the Irish treasure,<sup>7</sup> queen's gold,<sup>8</sup> and feudal dues.<sup>9</sup>

A survey of the available evidence concerning the Temple as a royal treasury leaves the impression that it was constantly employed for this purpose for about a century. The relations between it and the exchequer tended to become closer as time went on. In the first twelve or fifteen years of Edward I.'s reign, the Temple treasurer must constantly have been carrying on his books a large volume of accounts relative to the receipt of the royal revenue. Yet, important as these services must have been, it is at this point that the chief difference appears between the relation of the order to the fiscal system in England and in France. Unfortunately, in the matter of records, there is nothing for England comparable to a document printed by M. Delisle, which, he is convinced, is a part of a day-book kept by the Templars at the Temple in Paris during 1295-1296.<sup>10</sup> From this and from other evidence produced by M. Delisle, it is clear that, from the time of Louis IX. well into the reign of Philip the Fair, the chief royal treasury was at the Temple. The treasurer of the Temple was the king's treasurer. France, less fortunate than England in her administrative development, owed what order and system there were in the management of the fisc to the Templars. Yet, if in England the Temple played a comparatively subordinate rôle, it still seems to have been an integral part of the financial system of the government.

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1272-1279, p. 264. For further illustration of this practice, see *Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium* (R. C.), p. 21; Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 270, note F.

<sup>2</sup> Rymer, I. 87; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 516.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 437, cf. Dowell, *Taxation*, I. 37.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), III. 230-232; Rymer, I. 207; cf. Dowell, *Taxation*, I. 62, 66; Matthew Paris (R. S.), III. 221; cf. Dowell, *Taxation*, I. 65, 66; Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 270, note D; cf. Dowell, *Taxation*, I. 68; *Deputy Keeper's Report*, V. 64, No. 445; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1272-1279, pp. 21, 25, 79; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1272-1281, pp. 140-141; *Ibid.*, 1281-1292, pp. 70, 184; *Hist. MSS. Com.*, IV. 395.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1272-1279, p. 63.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1272-1281, pp. 52, 99, 100.

<sup>7</sup> *Calendar of Documents rel. to Ireland* (R. S.), I. No. 2871; No. 3013; No. 3189.

<sup>8</sup> *Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium* (R. C.), 21; Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 270, note E.

<sup>9</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 189; *Rotuli Selecti*, ed. J. Hunter (R. C.), 117; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1272-1172, p. 943; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1272-1281, pp. 166-167, 170-171, 208.

<sup>10</sup> Delisle, 73-86, app. xxix; also pp. 40-73 and app. xxii-xxviii.



Individual knights and the order as a whole were commonly employed by the English kings in the collection and transportation of revenue, missions for which they possessed obvious qualifications. Movable property was first taxed in order to provide money for the Crusades. In the ordinances of 1184 and 1188,<sup>1</sup> it is provided that a Templar and a Hospitaller should assist in the collection of the money in each district. It would seem from the story of Gilbert Hoxton that the Templars were sometimes unworthy of the trust imposed. Gilbert Hoxton was a brother of the Temple of Jerusalem whom the Lord King had appointed to collect tithes together with his clerks. Money was constantly being added to the chest, yet the sum total steadily diminished. It was presently found that Brother Gilbert was responsible for this phenomenon and we read that, although spared by the King, he was properly punished by the master of the Temple.<sup>2</sup>

Both John and Henry III. frequently sent Templars on financial errands.<sup>3</sup> In Henry III.'s time, the order of the Templars and that of the Hospitallers were employed for the transportation of money between England and Ireland, and between England and France. In 1228, for example, the indemnity which Henry III. had agreed to pay for injuries to the men of St. Émilion was entrusted, on account of the dangerous conditions of the roads, to the Templars in England, who undertook to see that it was safely brought to Paris.<sup>4</sup>

A Templar was sometimes employed as one of a board for auditing accounts.<sup>5</sup> In one case, in 1294, a committee of three to adjust the conversion from old to new money included both the preceptor and treasurer of the Temple in London.<sup>6</sup> Thus it seems to have been customary to employ Templars in matters of financial administration which involved skill, accuracy, and honesty throughout the thirteenth century. They must, therefore, have possessed these qualities in the opinion of the government. The order as a whole, and individual members, like Aimeric de St. Maur in the first quarter of the century or Brother Warin in the last, were honest and efficient agents in matters pertaining to finance.

The first of the functions to be examined under the general head of disbursements is in the nature of what would to-day be called

<sup>1</sup> Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 159; *Liber Custumarum* (R. S.), 654; *Benedict of Peterborough* (R. S.), II. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Benedict of Peterborough* (R. S.), II. 47-48.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 122, 123, 142, 159; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 381, 514, 558.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters, Henry III.* (R. S.), I. 336-337. See also *Rot. Claus.*, I. 431; *Rôles Gascons* (Ed. Michel), I. No. 3999; *Deputy Keeper's Report*, V. p. 62, No. 409.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar of Documents relating to Ireland* (R. S.), I. No. 2157; II. No. 238; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1272-1281*, pp. 379, 451.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 88.

"trusteeship." From the middle of the twelfth to late in the thirteenth century, the Templars occasionally acted as trustees of funds placed in their custody for the execution of some specified project, which they held for a longer or shorter time and then paid out according to the terms of the trust. Bishop Stubbs has pointed out the special qualifications of the military orders for services of this sort:<sup>1</sup>—"Their character as corporations, undying and free from the evils of old age and infancy, and, perhaps, a trust not misplaced in the virtue and honor of the knights."

The earliest notice of the employment of the Templars as trustees comes from the first part of Henry II.'s reign.<sup>2</sup> Louis VII. had taken from Stephen certain castles in Normandy which Henry II. was anxious to recover. He accordingly arranged a marriage between his infant son and Louis VII.'s daughter, who was to receive the castles as her dower. Until the children should be old enough to marry, it was agreed that the castles should be held in trust by the Templars. In Henry II.'s will there is an allusion to money entrusted to the Templars before 1182.<sup>3</sup> John, in 1214, made them trustees of certain sums to be paid to two of his French vassals.<sup>4</sup> To mention one of several instances in the reign of Henry III., the Countess of Leicester was induced to sign the renunciation clause in the treaty between Henry III. and Louis IX. only by the deposit of 15,000 marks with the Templars in Paris as a guaranty fund, securing her dower rights from the Marshall estate.<sup>5</sup> These examples sufficiently illustrate the confidence reposed in the order's integrity and stability by English kings for over a century.<sup>6</sup>

The thirteenth century kings of England were in an unfortunate position financially. Their needs had increased out of all proportion to their revenues, yet the king was still expected "to live of his own." Grants of supplies made from time to time by the Great Council were for emergencies of one sort and another, chiefly, of course, for war expenses. The collection of these grants took time; meanwhile expenses must be met. The earlier Norman kings pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Itinerarium . . . Ricardi* (R. S.), pp. cvi, cvii.

<sup>2</sup> William of Newburgh (R. S.), I. 158-159.

<sup>3</sup> Rymer, I. 47.

<sup>4</sup> M. Delisle (pp. 11-12) has explained that these pensions were awarded by John as a stroke of diplomacy to keep to their allegiance some of his vassals whose lands had been seized by Philip Augustus. See *Rol. Pat.*, 116, 119, 121.

<sup>5</sup> In 1273, Eleanor entered a claim for the 15,000 marks from Louis IX.'s executors. Philip III. wrote that Henry III. had received the money eight years before. See M. A. E. Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England*, II. 58-59; 114-115; Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 330-331, 182, 185, 250-251; *Deputy Keeper's Report*, VI. 90, Nos. 1124, 1130.

<sup>6</sup> See also *Calendar of Documents rel. to Scotland* (ed. J. Bain), I. Nos. 1003-1005; Rymer, I. 616; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1281-1292, p. 247.

vided against difficult situations of this sort by the practice of hoarding; but the loss of the continental possessions made this solution more difficult for John and his successors. In the backward economic condition of England, there was no class of subjects upon which the king could rely for loans. Thus the question of financing their projects was for the English kings of this period an extremely serious one. The Jews were systematically drained dry of all the gold which the royal license enabled them to absorb. Extortion was practised upon the religious corporations. After the middle of the century, loans from the Italian merchants become prominent in the records.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, the Templars were very wealthy. From the early days of its foundation, gifts to the order had been considered acts of piety calculated to promote the eternal welfare of the giver's soul, a subject in which the average man of the Middle Ages was most deeply interested. The order, therefore, acquired great estates from which large revenues poured into its treasury. That much capital was placed in its charge by individuals has already been shown. Thus the Templars were in a position to become the bankers of the English kings, since they had ready money and were in close financial relations with the government. The surprising thing is not that the kings borrowed of them, but that they did not borrow much oftener and in larger amounts than the evidence indicates.

Throughout his reign John frequently applied to the Templars for money, which they lent him sometimes on security, sometimes, apparently, on the royal promise to pay. In the last four years of his reign John often stayed at the Temple.<sup>2</sup> The master of the order in England, Aimeric de St. Maur, was one of those who steadily supported the King to the end. He advised John to sign Magna Charta, in which instrument his name appears;<sup>3</sup> and he was named in John's will as an executor with Pandulf, William Briwere, Walter de Lacy, Falkes de Breauté, and others.<sup>4</sup> John evidently depended much on his aid and counsel.<sup>5</sup> Aimeric de St. Maur lived until about 1219 when he was succeeded by Alan Marcel.<sup>6</sup> The sums which the Templars lent to King John range from the comparatively trifling amount of one gold mark, which he borrowed in 1213 for an offering on the day of his absolution,<sup>7</sup> to loans of

<sup>1</sup> Bond, pp. 212-225.

<sup>2</sup> Itinerary of John, in *Rot. Pat.*, Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 296; Matthew Paris (*R. S.*), II. 584, 589-590.

<sup>4</sup> Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 17; Rymer, I. 144.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 38, 156, 157.

<sup>6</sup> *Deputy Keeper's Report*, IV. 156.

<sup>7</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 148.



one thousand marks at a time which enabled him to bring Poitevin troops to his aid in England in 1215.<sup>1</sup> In the years from 1203 to 1206, the Templars frequently lent John the money necessary for the ransom of his soldiers or agents who had been captured in France. The accommodation seems often to have consisted both in supplying the money and in effecting the payment of the ransom between, for example, London and Paris, or London and Gascony.<sup>2</sup> In the summer of 1216, John twice applied to the Templars for money. Brother Aimeric lent 200 marks to Engelard de Cygony in July and received a receipt from John in August.<sup>3</sup> In September, about six weeks before his death, John wrote from Oxford to the bailiffs of Bristol that he was trying to borrow 200 marks from the Templars with which to reward the town for its aid.<sup>4</sup> The Templars, in common with all the other religious corporations, had to submit to extortion on John's part; as in 1210 when he raised £100,000 from church property by "inestimable and incomparable exactions," and the Black Friars, Hospitallers, and Templars were heavily taxed.<sup>5</sup>

Henry III.'s borrowings of the Templars were chiefly to meet expenses arising from his relations with France. The peace of Lambeth which secured the withdrawal of Prince Louis from England involved the payment of 10,000 marks. For this purpose 500 marks were borrowed from the Templars in 1221, and the issues of the manor of Godmanchester were turned over to them until the debt should have been discharged.<sup>6</sup> The order furnished money for the expenses of an embassy to France in 1225<sup>7</sup>; and, in 1242, when Henry III. had been reduced to financial straits by the ignominious Gascon expedition, a loan of 500 marks was made to him by the Templars in Paris.<sup>8</sup> In the next period of Henry's reign the pressure for money was very great. Heavy loans were made by the merchants of Florence and Sienna to meet the expenses of the Pope's Sicilian projects which the King had undertaken to finance.<sup>9</sup> In the troubled years from 1260 to 1266, money was raised on the crown jewels which had been sent to France,

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 194, 198, 221; *Rot. Pat.*, 135, 141, 152, 153; see also pp. 11 and 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. de Liberate*, ed. Hardy (R. C.), 54; *Rot. Pat.*, 33, 41, 42, 51, 65, 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 190, 192.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 196.

<sup>5</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), II. 530; *Annales Monastici* (R. S.), II. 264.

<sup>6</sup> Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 25; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 376, 465, 479. A loan of £250 was also made in this year. *Ibid.*, I. 514.

<sup>7</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, II. 55.

<sup>8</sup> *Rôles Gascons* (ed. Michel), I. 132.

<sup>9</sup> Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 68-73.

where the Queen placed them in the Temple at Paris.<sup>1</sup> The Templars were connected with these operations, but as intermediaries not as principals.

The expenses of Edward's expedition to the Holy Land were not covered by the twentieth granted in 1269 and devoted to that purpose.<sup>2</sup> Large advances were made by the Templars in Paris and in the Holy Land. In the first year of his reign, Edward made a payment of 2,000 marks on a debt of £28,189 8s. 4d., for which he was bound to the treasurer of the Temple at Paris.<sup>3</sup> In 1274, William of Beaulieu, master of the order, acknowledged the repayment by Edward of money which he had borrowed of the Templars in the Holy Land to the amount of £24,974 and £5,333 6s. 8d.<sup>4</sup> It does not appear that Edward I. borrowed of the Templars so frequently as his father had done.<sup>5</sup> The Italian societies of merchants supplied him with large sums. For example, in 1299, Edward guaranteed the agents of the Friscobaldi in London against any loss they might incur in connection with a loan of "2,000 pollard marks and other money now current in England," which the King had appointed them to receive of Brother Hugh, a Templar. The King agreed to pay back the loan to the Templars at a specified rate and time.<sup>6</sup> Edward also borrowed of the Hospitallers, as in 1276, when they lent him 2,000 marks.<sup>7</sup>

Throughout the thirteenth century, it appears that the Templars frequently acted as the bankers of the English kings in the matter of loans, though the sums advanced, if Edward I.'s borrowings in the Holy Land be excluded, do not make an impressive total as compared with money derived from other sources. The order showed its practical business methods by exacting security and by the definite arrangements for repayment which were usually specified in the documents. The question as to how the Templars indemnified themselves for their services in these and other financial operations

<sup>1</sup> Rymer, I. 410, 435, 492, 505.

<sup>2</sup> *Deputy Keeper's Report*, V. 64, No. 445.

<sup>3</sup> *Issues of the Exchequer*, translated by F. Devon, pp. xvii, 86; Rymer, I. 708.

<sup>4</sup> Delisle, p. 245; Rymer, I. 514. Edward's notes, the letter adds, had been deposited at the Temple in Paris and could not be returned because the roads were insecure. See also Rymer, I. 516.

<sup>5</sup> For further examples of loans made to Henry III. by the Templars, see *Rot. Claus.*, I. 612; II. 4; *Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium* (R. C.), 21; *Deputy Keeper's Report*, V. 85, No. 879. Sometimes the Templars refused to comply with Henry's demands. Matthew Paris (R. S.), V. 364.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 419. For other loans made by the Templars to Edward I., see *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1272-1281*, p. 375; Madox, *Exchequer*, I. 612-613; *Calendarium Rotulorum Originalium* (R. C.), I. 114.

<sup>7</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1272-1281*, p. 147. See also *Calendarium Rotulorum Originalium* (R. C.), I. 114; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1301-1307*, p. 443.

can more conveniently be examined after the other matters have been considered.

Frequent notices occur in the records of the thirteenth century of payments made through the agency of the Templars. Some of these are in the nature of drafts upon a standing account. The king would address a letter to the master or to the master and brothers of the Temple, authorizing the payment, "from our treasure entrusted to you to guard," of definite sums to specified persons or their accredited agents. A few examples from each reign will sufficiently illustrate this practice.

John drew heavily upon his reserves at the New Temple for the operations in which he was engaged during the last four years of his reign. In the critical period from 1212 to 1214, large sums were sent to the continent to the Emperor Otto who was John's chief ally against Philip Augustus,<sup>1</sup> and to the King's half-brother, William Longsword, Earl of Salisbury, who was in command of the English forces in Flanders and was captured at Bouvines together with Ferrand, Count of Flanders.<sup>2</sup>

In 1235, Henry III. gave his sister Isabella in marriage to the Emperor Frederick with the large sum of 30,000 marks as a marriage portion. The prompt payment of the money indicates the cordial relations between King and Emperor at this time. The last installment of 10,000 marks was paid to the Emperor's messengers by Brother Hugh de Stocton, treasurer of the Temple, from the King's deposits there, in June, 1237.<sup>3</sup> Arrangements were made, in June, 1274, for providing Edward I. with funds when he should arrive in Paris on his way home from the Holy Land. Warin, treasurer of the New Temple, was directed to pay, for this purpose, 2,000 marks to an Italian merchant, Luke de Lucca.<sup>4</sup> These transactions which the Templars performed for John, Henry III. and Edward I. apparently did not, in any case, involve a more complicated operation than that of cashing an order, on its presentation by the proper person at the Temple.

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I., 124, 179; Rymer, I., 108.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I., 136; *Rot. Pat.*, XX. 100, 103, 104. In May, 1213, 10,000 marks were withdrawn from the King's deposits at the Temple. *Rot. Claus.*, I. 134. In 1214, Pandulf received orders for large sums to be paid from the King's deposits at the Temple. Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, I. 561; *Rot. Pat.*, 107. See also *Rot. Pat.*, 104, 173.

<sup>3</sup> Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 52; Bond, 236; M. A. E. Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England* II. 11; Rymer, I. 232. See also *Cal. of Doc. rel. to Ireland* (R. S.), 1171-1251, No. 2871.

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1272-1281, p. 52. Edward I. frequently drew upon his deposits at the New Temple through orders to Brother Warin. See *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1272-1281, pp. 83, 84, 100, 140, 141.



In the class of disbursements next to be considered, money was transferred from the treasury to the Temple for the purpose of discharging definite obligations. The king wrote a letter to his barons of the exchequer or to his treasurer and chamberlains directing the payment to the Templars of a specified sum "to the use" of a specified person. The obligations thus discharged consisted of debts, including the repayment of some of the loans already considered, of gifts, and the execution of financial clauses in formal treaties and in more or less informal agreements which bound the king to the payment of marriage portions, pensions, and the like. It is not possible always to be sure as to just what function the Templars performed in these cases. Usually it is clear that their services consisted in accomplishing a payment between London and the continent without the actual transfer of money; that is, the Templars seem at an early period to have worked out between their various commanderies a system of money transfers by bills of exchange of which kings, magnates, and also the Italian merchants seem freely to have availed themselves.<sup>1</sup>

It has already been observed that sometimes the Templars lent the money to meet a certain obligation and arranged for its payment to the person concerned. Repayment was sometimes provided for under their auspices. This was true of some of the ransoms in John's reign, notably those of William Briwere and Gerard de Athies.<sup>2</sup> John wrote from Oxford, July 22, 1215, directing his treasurer and chamberlains to pay to the Templars in England 1,100 marks on a debt which he owed Master Gerard Brochard in Poitou.<sup>3</sup> In 1226, Henry III. bought a ship of the Spanish Templars. On July seventh he wrote to the master of the order in Spain that 200 marks for the price of the ship would be rendered him at the house of the New Temple in London in the hands of the master of that house; should this amount be unsatisfactory, more would be added.<sup>4</sup> In 1257, a sum of 540 marks which Henry III. had borrowed of the merchants of Florence was to be repaid at the New Temple, London. The loan was made for the "affair in Sicily." The

<sup>1</sup> For the early history of bills of exchange, see Goldschmidt, *Universalgeschichte des Handelsrechts* (1891), 403-465, and Endemann, *Studien in der Romanisch-canonistischen Wirthschafts- und Rechtslehre*, I. 75-115.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 41, 42, 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 221; see also *Rot. Pat.*, 152. In 1242, Henry III. at Bordeaux offered to repay the money, which he hoped to borrow of the master of the Temple at Paris, either in London or in Paris. *Rôles Gascons* (ed. Michel), I. No. 994. The loan to the Friscobaldi in 1299 was to be repaid at the Temple in Paris. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 419.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, II. 154. An order of the same date was made for the payment of three marks to Brother Martin of the Temple in Spain for his expenses home. *Rot. Claus.*, II. 127.

instrument quoted in Rymer is a bond given by the King's procurers at Viterbo to certain merchants of Sienna and Florence. Payment was to be made next Pentecost at the New Temple in London.<sup>1</sup>

The Templars often executed the financial clauses of treaties, as in the case of the annual payment to the pope<sup>2</sup> and the indemnity to Louis of France,<sup>3</sup> burdens resulting from John's folly and misrule with which the government of Henry III. found itself charged. An excellent illustration of the way in which payments on the continent were accomplished through the New Temple in London appears in an agreement between Henry III. and the Count of March for the transfer of the island of Oleron. Henry was to pay £200 to the master of the Temple in England annually for five years; the Templars were to pay the Count of March.<sup>4</sup>

The Templars were often employed for accomplishing the payment of gifts, marriage portions, pensions, and matters of that sort. The earliest notice occurs towards the close of Henry II.'s reign. The King agreed to give the widow of his son Henry £2,750 a year. One payment was to be made at the Temple at Sainte Vaubourg near Rouen in the spring, the other in the winter at Paris.<sup>5</sup> In 1215, John wrote to the Pope concerning the dower of his sister-in-law, Berengaria. He had agreed to give her 2,000 marks for arrears and 1,000 marks annually in the future; the money was to be paid through the house of the New Temple in London.<sup>6</sup> Arrangements were made in 1248 for yearly pensions to the King's uncles, Thomas and Amadeus of Savoy. Of the 700 marks paid into the exchequer annually by Hugh le Bigod, 500 were to be placed in the New Temple for Thomas, 200 for Amadeus.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rymer, I. 365. This use of the Temple by the Italian merchants was not uncommon. In 1258, Henry III., his wife, and his son Edward borrowed 10,000 marks of the Florentine merchants pledging themselves to repay at the New Temple before June 24. See Pat. 42, Henry III., m. 6, cited by Bémont, *Rôles Gascons*, II. p. cxxv. For other examples of the custom of paying debts through the Temple, see *Rotuli de Liberate*, ed. Hardy (R. C.), p. 8; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 159, 471.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 396. See also *Rôles Gascons* (ed. Michel), I. p. 259, No. 2035.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 415, 465.

<sup>4</sup> Rymer, I. 218. In 1253, it was arranged that the bill of damages, which Henry III. had agreed to pay to his kinsman, the Count of Toulouse, for the depredations of his Gascon subjects, should be discharged at the Temple in Paris. *Rôles Gascons* (ed. Michel), I. No. 2175. For examples in 1259 and in 1279, see Rymer, I. 383, 409, 572.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar of Documents preserved in France* (R. S.), 918-1206, pp. 382-383.

<sup>6</sup> *Rot. Pat.*, 181. Berengaria still had trouble in getting her money. The next year, John wrote to beg her to wait for payment until "the dark cloud which threatens us shall have been dissipated." *Rot. Pat.*, pp. xx, 200; *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies*, ed. M. A. E. Wood, I. 31; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 480.

<sup>7</sup> Rymer, I. 269. Other pensions paid for the King by the Templars are as follows: Peter Sarracen, *Rot. Claus.*, I. 544; see also pp. 363, 381, and Delisle, p. 39; Vicomte de Thouars, *Rot. Claus.*, I. 581, 594; Hugh of Ostia, bishop and cardinal, *Rot. Claus.*, II. 118; Hubert Huese, *Rot. Claus.*, II. 126; Ferrand, Count of Flanders, Rymer, I. 196.

Services of this kind, often involving payments at a distance without the actual transfer of funds, were performed for the English kings by the Templars, especially in the first half of the thirteenth century; that is, before the societies of foreign merchants had become fully established in England. The Hospitallers may occasionally have rendered similar services,<sup>1</sup> but it seems that, on the whole, the Templars had the field almost to themselves until the middle of the century. These payments were, therefore, perhaps the most important of the financial operations conducted by the order for the English Crown.

Financial operations of the kind which have been described were performed by the Templars for nobles, merchants, and in general for such individuals or corporations as had need of them. A charter of the period between 1202 and 1206 sets forth the adjustment of a dispute by which Hugh of Gloucester agreed to pay the abbot and monks of La Couture yearly, at Mid-Lent, ten marks of silver at the New Temple, London, in return for the possession of a manor and church which had been in dispute.<sup>2</sup> In 1205, four merchants of Cahors borrowed at the Temple the twenty marks which they were obliged to pay the King for his license to trade.<sup>3</sup> The Templars had lent money to Hubert de Burgh, as it appears from an order in the close rolls of 1233. Henry III. had imprisoned Hubert but permitted the master of the Templars and Philip de Heye to have an interview with him in the presence of his guards. Nothing was to be spoken of but the money which Hubert owed to the brothers of the Temple.<sup>4</sup>

The Caursine usurers bound their debtors to payment at the New Temple, London.<sup>5</sup> In 1252, a charter of the abbot and convent of St. Albans attested that they had borrowed 115 marks from a certain foreign merchant which they agreed to repay at a fixed time at the New Temple.<sup>6</sup> Fulk, Archbishop of Dublin, in 1066 repaid at the Temple in London a loan of £100 and 550 marks for which he was indebted to the merchants of Florence.<sup>7</sup> In 1283, Godfrey le Herdler, Gilbert de Harwe, goldsmiths, and Bartholomew, the cook, acknowledged themselves bound to the prior of the

<sup>1</sup> *Documents Illustrative of English History*, ed. Henry Cole (R. C.), 245; *Lettres de Rois* (ed. Champollion-Figeac), I. 94-95.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of Documents preserved in France* (R. S.), 918-1206, No. 1041.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 55.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters, Henry III.* (R. S.), I. 525.

<sup>5</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), III. 329.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, VI. 221.

<sup>7</sup> *Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland* (R. S.), pp. 166-168; *Historica MSS. Commission*, X. 216.



knights of the Temple of London in the sum of twelve shillings.<sup>1</sup> A few years later, in 1290, Richard Peterel bound himself to pay a debt of £118 17s. 6d., which he owed William de Hamelton for corn, at the New Temple "in the quinzaine of St. Michael."<sup>2</sup> These examples illustrate the position of the Templars as agents in an annual payment between England and France, as money-lenders, and as intermediaries between foreign merchants and their debtors.

The Templars could not have engaged in financial operations so extensively as the evidence indicates without a somewhat elaborate and minute system of bookkeeping, and in many respects they must have incurred risks and expenses similar to those of the modern banker. On the interesting question as to how the Templars indemnified themselves for these expenses, the available records throw practically no light. There are notices, now and then, of royal gifts to the order,<sup>3</sup> and, what is more significant, of grants of special privileges in trade, as for shipping wine<sup>4</sup> and wool.<sup>5</sup> M. Delisle believes that the Templars made loans on suitable security from the capital deposited with them.<sup>6</sup> The question still remains as to how this profited them in an age which held the sentiments of the thirteenth century on the subject of taking interest. The<sup>7</sup> most suggestive evidence is to be found in the clause of the bonds, exacted by the foreign merchants of their debtors, which obliged the borrower to make an additional payment, "pro recompensacione dampnorum, interesse, et expensis," in case the money was not repaid at a specified time. Several such bonds have been referred to in order to illustrate the employment of the Temple as an exchange through which payments were made. The earliest, that quoted by Matthew Paris in his narrative for the year 1235, is the bond of the Causine usurers, so-called, who were the "papal merchants" from Cahors and other cities of southern France and Italy, and who came to England in that year to engage in the collection of the papal revenues.<sup>8</sup> The borrowers agreed that, if they were unable to repay the money at a specified time, they would pay one mark for ten, every two months, for losses incurred.<sup>9</sup> This is a rate of sixty

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Letter-Books*, Letter-Book A (ed. R. R. Sharpe), p. 72.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 129-130.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 17, 149; *Calendar of Documents rel. to Ireland* (R. S.), I. No. 2915.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Claus.*, I. 159; *Rot. Pat.*, III.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 104; *Rot. Claus.*, I. 609.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 15, 87.

<sup>7</sup> For the doctrine of interest or usury, see Ashley, *Economic History*, I. §17; II. §65.

<sup>8</sup> Ashley, *Economic History*, I. 198; Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, I. 208; Bond, 212-215.

<sup>9</sup> Matthew Paris (R. S.), III. 329.

per cent. per annum, seventeen per cent. more than the Jews were permitted to bargain for.<sup>1</sup>

The exacting of any payment for the use of money which had been loaned was, of course, forbidden by the canon law and was abhorrent to the moral and religious feeling of the time. While commerce remained undeveloped, this feeling may be justified, as Professor Ashley has shown.<sup>2</sup> But as trade revived, constant evasions necessitated constant efforts at repression by the courts Christian within whose jurisdiction the matter lay. The Jews practised usury, and could not be deterred by such penalties as excommunication or refusal of Christian burial, the only ones at the disposal of the Church tribunals. The clause in the bonds, quoted above, was a device worked out in the first half of the thirteenth century by which Christians might make a profit on loans and still save their consciences and keep the letter of the law. Here was an elastic method for extending the business and the gains of the money-lender. "Interesse" was used in its original sense, meaning "id quod interest," that is, the difference between the creditor's present position and what it would have been if the terms of the agreement had been fulfilled and the debt paid at the appointed time. Even in the feeling of the period, the lender might conceivably incur loss by the delay, and therefore be entitled to compensation.<sup>3</sup> We know that the French and Italian merchants practised this device or evasion, and that it was employed on one occasion by the head of the order of the Knights Templars. The possibility existed for the Templars to make large profits through the capital in their hands. To what extent they availed themselves of their opportunities, we have no means of knowing.

Records extending over a period of more than a century prove conclusively the close relations which existed between the English government and the Knights Templars. The financial operations which they performed for the English kings consisted, briefly, in the custody of treasure and the receipt of royal revenue, on the one

<sup>1</sup> Ashley, *Economic History*, I. 200. A similar clause was inserted in the note given for 115 marks to Florentine merchants by the abbot and monks of St. Albans in 1252, Matthew Paris (R. S.), VI. 221; in the loan negotiated at Viterbo for Henry III. in 1257, Rymer, I. 365; in the note given by Henry III. to merchants of Florence for a loan of 10,000 marks, in 1258, *Rôles Gascons* (ed. Charles Bémont), II. cxxv.; and in that of Fulk, Archbishop of Dublin to Florentine merchants, in 1266; *Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland* (R. S.), 166-168. Finally, in the acquittance sent to Edward I., in 1274, by the master of the Templars, William of Beaulieu, for the repayment of the loan made to him in Palestine, a sum paid "tam super principali quam super custibus, dampnis, et interesse," is expressly mentioned. Rymer, I. 514.

<sup>2</sup> Ashley, *Economic History*, I. 155; II. 394-395; Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, I. 258.

<sup>3</sup> Ashley, *Economic History*, I. 196; II. 399.

hand, and, on the other, in the administration of trusts, the advancing of loans, cashing of orders on deposits, and in effecting payments between London and the continent. The evidence shows, not that the Templars at any time financed the projects of the kings—the loans amount to a comparatively insignificant sum—but that their most useful services consisted in the handling of money derived from other sources. The practice of employing the Templars in financial affairs appears fully developed at so early a period, that they must, almost from the beginning, have been characterized by the integrity and administrative capacity which led men to turn to them in matters of trust; and, as the custom persisted up to the hour of their destruction, they must have continued to inspire confidence. Yet the Templars were certainly very unpopular with their contemporaries. That they shared the popular disfavor with the foreign merchants and the Jews is perhaps a significant fact. It has been suggested that, in addition to all the familiar explanations of their unpopularity, the fact should be taken into consideration that their connection with a lucrative financial business involved them in the suspicion which attached to all who were engaged in monetary transactions.<sup>1</sup> The important civil services performed by the Templars have been eclipsed by the splendor and romance of their military exploits. It seems, however, that by their financial operations they contributed to the progress of civilization in their time, and that posterity should recognize the services which in contemporary opinion brought them only dislike and distrust.

The circumstances under which the Templars met their end are sufficiently tragic, whether Philip the Fair's accusations had any basis in fact or not. Students of the subject to-day are practically agreed that the charges brought against them were totally unfounded. The iniquity of Philip's attack, which has been called the greatest crime of the Middle Ages, becomes the deeper as the order's efficient performance of the peaceful as well as of the military functions entrusted to it is the more clearly revealed.

ELEANOR FERRIS.

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, I. 274.

## HABEAS CORPUS IN THE COLONIES

THE writ of habeas corpus has been regarded as one of the important safeguards of personal liberty, and the struggle for its possession has marked the advance of constitutional government. Magna Charta, Darnel's Case, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights and the Habeas Corpus Act bear witness to the importance of the struggle. Our rights at the present day therefore depend upon those acquired by our English forefathers as transmitted to the colonies, which are the connecting link in the process. Hence it is essential that we should know what rights the colonists possessed.

The ordinary conception is that the colonies did not have habeas corpus until it was given to them by England itself, and Queen Anne generally receives the credit for thus graciously extending the privileges of the writ. This idea rests primarily upon the statement of Chalmers. In speaking of Virginia he says that Spotswood, the new Governor, "was received by the Virginians with acclamations, because he had brought them liberty. Influenced by her new advisers, who had been, however, honored with colonial hatred, the Queen gave unsolicited to the provincials the invaluable benefit of the habeas corpus act, which had been denied by the late ministers."<sup>1</sup> This statement applied only to Virginia, and yet the impression seems to be general that the benefit was conferred upon the other colonies as well. It is doubtful if this so-called extension of the writ of habeas corpus really gave the Virginians much more than they already possessed. Just what was granted depends upon Spotswood's proclamation, which up to the present has not been printed. It will appear below; but before examining the document, it will be necessary to consider just what the writ of habeas corpus is, and what its status was in the other colonies.

The writ of habeas corpus is issued by a court of law or equity, and commands that the body of the prisoner be produced before the court, in order that it may inquire into the cause of imprisonment or detention. Consequently it is meant for the protection of personal liberty and is properly known as the writ of *habeas corpus ad subjiciendum*. Although there are other writs of habeas corpus, yet this is the one which holds the high place in history. The thought underlying the writ depends upon early Saxon conceptions

<sup>1</sup> George Chalmers, *Introduction to the Revolt*, I. 395.

of individual right, and is fully expressed in the Magna Charta, which says that no free man shall be "taken or imprisoned or dispossessed, or outlawed, or banished . . . except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."<sup>1</sup> This clause against arbitrary imprisonment was a formal expression of what already existed in the common law. Just when writs of this sort began to issue at common law is uncertain, but by the fifteenth century they were fully recognized.<sup>2</sup> In the strife of the seventeenth century between the powers of the King and the rights of the people, habeas corpus is frequently appealed to. These demands finally culminated in the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, which provided for the effective application of the writ. It should be noticed that the law did not grant anything new; that it did not make habeas corpus, but merely made efficient a writ, which was recognized as already existing. The common law nature of the writ has been recognized by English and American courts,<sup>3</sup> and it is a fair question whether our rights depend upon the common law or upon the statute of Charles II. Certainly it is worth inquiring whether the writ of habeas corpus extended to the colonies by common law or by statute law.

This question is answered in the opinions of the law officers of the English Crown, and in the rulings of the court. In 1720 Mr. West gave an opinion on the extension of the common law to the colonies, in which he said:

"The Common Law of England is the Common Law of the Plantations, and all statutes in affirmance of the Common Law passed in England antecedent to the settlement of the colony, are in force in that colony, unless there is some private Act to the contrary; though no statutes made since those settlements are there in force unless the colonists are particularly mentioned. Let an Englishman go where he will, he carries as much of law and liberty with him, as the nature of things will bear."<sup>4</sup>

In 1729 the Attorney-General Yorke gave an important opinion upon the statute law in the following words:

"I am of opinion that such general statutes as have been made since the settlement of Maryland, and are not by express words located either to the plantations in general or to the Province in particular, are not in force there, unless they have been introduced and declared to be laws by some Acts of Assembly of the Province, or have been received there by long uninterrupted usage or practice."<sup>5</sup>

These famous opinions clearly state that the common law of England becomes *ipso facto* the common law of the colonies, and

<sup>1</sup> Magna Charta, Section 39. G. C. Lee, *Source-book of English History*, 175.

<sup>2</sup> W. S. Church, *A Treatise on the Writ of Habeas Corpus*, 3-4.

<sup>3</sup> McAll, I, 71, 72. Also *Md. Reports*, XXXVIII. 203.

<sup>4</sup> George Chalmers, *Opinions* (Colonial), 206.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.



that all statutes affirming the common law passed antecedent to the foundation of the colonies also extend thither. No statute laws made since the settlement would extend to the plantations unless they were especially mentioned, or unless they had been adopted by special legislation of the colonies, whose freedom in this respect was limited by the fact that most of their laws required the approval of England. Usage, precedent and practice were mightier forces than legislation, in extending English law; and the Attorney-General recognized this truth. There is little doubt that a much larger number of English statutes were applied in the colonies than would have been adopted in form had they been submitted to the provincial assemblies. This is explained by the fact that many of the colonial lawyers received their training in England, where they imbibed both statute law and common law.<sup>1</sup>

The distinction between the common law and the statute law should be kept clear, for many difficulties will thus be cleared away. Even Chalmers had a tendency to confuse the two, for in speaking of the common law he says that the colonists did not know the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus.<sup>2</sup> In another place, speaking of the Habeas Corpus Act of Massachusetts, he maintains that it was unnecessary, evidently thinking of the common law.<sup>3</sup> The distinction between the two has been carefully upheld by the courts, which have asserted in so many words that our forefathers brought the common law writ of habeas corpus to this Country.<sup>4</sup> The question arises which are the statutes upon the subject and do they apply to America?

The great English statute is that of Charles II., which is known as "An Act for the better securing the liberty of the subject and for the prevention of imprisonments beyond the seas."<sup>5</sup> It was passed in 1679 by rather doubtful means, if the story of Burnet is to be believed. In the preamble it is asserted that there had been great delays on the part of sheriffs and jailors in making returns to writs of habeas corpus for men imprisoned for criminal or supposed criminal matters. Consequently it was enacted that when such a writ was served upon the sheriff or jailor, or upon any of their under officers they should within three days bring or cause to be brought the body of the prisoner before the judge issuing the writ, unless the warrant of commitment was for treason or felony. A fine of five hundred pounds was laid upon the judge for failure to grant the

<sup>1</sup> See N. J. (Coxe), I. 389, foot-note. Dall, I. 75.

<sup>2</sup> G. Chalmers, *Political Annals of the Present United Colonies*, I. 678.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* New York Historical Society Collections for 1868, 113.

<sup>4</sup> See McAll, I. 70 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, V. 935.

writ, while the jailor forfeited a hundred pounds for not making a return. This law was made to apply to any county palatine, to the Cinque Ports, and other privileged places within England, Wales, Berwick on Tweed, and the islands of Jersey and Guernsey. Persons charged with debt or civil action were excluded from the benefits of the act, while the criminal class was limited by the treason and felony clause. Lecky says that before the Revolution of 1688 there were only fifty capital offenses upon the statute book, but the number was increased until in 1770 it was estimated in Parliament that such crimes numbered one hundred and fifty, while Blackstone says that at that time they equalled one hundred and sixty. In 1786 it was said that the number had increased.<sup>1</sup> Felonious crimes tended to increase in number throughout the eighteenth century, and hence the Habeas Corpus Act was greatly limited. It is important only as marking the beginning of efficient legal protection for individual liberty, but its power grew as the terms "felony" and "treason" were limited in their meaning.

This statute, which is now considered to be one of the fundamentals of English liberty, makes no mention of the colonies. Hence, according to the opinions already cited, it did not extend to the plantations; and further testimony bears out the same conclusion. When the Charter of Liberties of New York came before the committee of trade and plantations, March 3, 1684, it contained the following clause: "That the Inhabitants of New York shall be governed by and according to the Laws of England." The committee observed that "This Privilege is not granted to any of His Ma<sup>ty</sup>s Plantations where the Act of habeas corpus and all such other Bills do not take Place."<sup>2</sup> In 1692 Massachusetts passed a Habeas Corpus Act, which was practically a copy of the English act. Three years later this came before the Privy Council, which disallowed it: "Whereas . . . the writt of Habeas Corpus is required to be granted in like manner as is appointed by the Statute 31 Car. II. in England, which priviledge has not as yet been granted to any of His Maj<sup>ty</sup>s Plantations, It was not thought fitt in His Maj<sup>ty</sup>s absence that the said Act should continue in force and therefore the same is repealed."<sup>3</sup>

These quotations only strengthen the opinions first given and prove that the Habeas Corpus Act did not extend to the colonies; but they do not prove that the colonists failed to enjoy the writ, as will be seen from an examination of the conditions in the various colonies.

<sup>1</sup> W. E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the 18th Century*, VI. 246.

<sup>2</sup> *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York*, III. 357.

<sup>3</sup> *Acts and Resolves of the Province of Mass.*, I. 99.

We have already noticed that in Massachusetts a Habeas Corpus Act was passed in 1692 which lasted for three years before it was repealed. This act, like that of England, laid heavy fines on both judge and jailor for the nonfulfilment of its provisions, and it also provided that even in cases of treason and felony the person should be released unless indicted at the next term of court.<sup>1</sup> There is evidence that before this Massachusetts was alive to the importance of legal protection, for we find a paper in the handwriting of Cotton Mather (probably written in 1686 before the arrival of Andros), in which he says that they were slaves without the Habeas Corpus Act, and that agents by their solicitations might get it allowed to them; that now was the time to strive for it.<sup>2</sup> This warning was needed, for in 1689 we find Judge Dudley arbitrarily refusing a writ of habeas corpus to a Mr. Wise.<sup>3</sup> There is nothing in the incident, however, to indicate that there was anything new in the asking for such a writ. That it must have been a common practice is also shown by Samuel Sewall, for he speaks in his *Diary*, Dec. 11, 1705, of issuing a habeas corpus.<sup>4</sup> This is especially interesting, for it was issued after the Massachusetts act was repealed and shows that the writ did not depend upon any statute law.

In New Hampshire, August 5, 1684, there was an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a Mr. Vaughan, who asked for it according to the statute commonly called the Habeas Corpus Act of 31 Charles II.<sup>5</sup> A writ seems to have issued and an examination followed which resulted in the return of the prisoner to the jail. This was a case of arbitrary imprisonment growing out of a quarrel with the governor.

New York in 1690 had an interesting case resulting from the Leisler rebellion. To this writ of habeas corpus an insufficient return was made, and we find the bystanders hissing the court, which clearly shows the common ideas regarding the rights of habeas corpus.<sup>6</sup> Here again there is nothing to indicate that the issuance of the writ was anything extraordinary. In the court laws there are some indications of habeas corpus, and these, together with the bail laws, formed the only strictly legal protection for personal liberty.

William Pinhorne, a New Jersey judge, refused to grant a writ of habeas corpus to Thomas Gordon, the speaker of the assembly.

<sup>1</sup> For the act itself see the above, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Mass. Historical Society Collections*, Series 4, VIII. 390.

<sup>3</sup> W. S. Church, *A Treatise on the Writ of Habeas Corpus*, 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Mass. Historical Society Collections*, Series 5, VI. 147.

<sup>5</sup> *Provincial Papers*, edited by Nathaniel Bouton, I. 542.

<sup>6</sup> *Docs. Relating to Colonial History of N. Y.*, III. 680.

The latter was kept in prison fifteen hours and then was only released to bail upon an application made by a lawyer, who was the son of the judge.<sup>1</sup>

Pennsylvania made provision for the issuing of writs of habeas corpus in the various court laws. Although these were repealed frequently in England, yet they were again and again re-enacted. In the laws of 1682 provision was made that any one unlawfully imprisoned should have double damages against the informer or prosecutor. This was abrogated in 1693, but was re-enacted the same year.<sup>2</sup> It was upon such acts that the legal protection of the Pennsylvanians depended.

One of the most interesting bits of colonial legislation was that of South Carolina, which passed an act in 1692 empowering the magistrates to "execute and put in force an Act made in the Kingdom of England, Anno 31, Caroli 2, Regis, commonly called the Habeas Corpus Act."<sup>3</sup> McCrady says that this act was disallowed by the proprietors on the ground that it was unnecessary as the laws of England applied to the colony.<sup>4</sup> The act seems to have been enforced despite the decision of the proprietors, for we find that the act of 1712 repealed in so many words that of 1692. The new law of 1712 provided that any two of the lords proprietors deputies, or the chief justice of the province, or any one of the lords proprietors deputies and one of the justices of the peace, or any two of the justices of the peace could put in execution the Habeas Corpus Act as "fully, effectually and lawfully as any Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper, or any of Her Majestie's Justices, either of the one Bench, or the Barons of the Exchequer."<sup>5</sup> This laid an extraordinarily heavy fine of five hundred pounds for the failure to execute the act. It also held that "all and every person which now is or hereafter shall be within any part of this Province, shall have to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, and in all things whatsoever, as large ample and effectual right to and benefit of the said act, commonly called the Habeas Corpus Act, as if he were personally in the said Kingdom of England."<sup>5</sup> This statute remained the law of South Carolina through the first quarter of the nineteenth century, and it is a good illustration of the difference between the laws of the various colonies. That South Carolina was more fortunate than Massachusetts may be explained by the fact that the law of the former might not have been submitted to England.

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Smith, *Hist. of the Colony of N. J.*, 391.

<sup>2</sup> *Charters to William Penn and Laws of the Province of Pa., 1682-1700*, 100.

<sup>3</sup> *Statutes of S. C.*, edited by Thomas Cooper, II. 74.

<sup>4</sup> Edward McCrady, *History of South Carolina, 1670-1719*, 247-248.

<sup>5</sup> *Statutes of S. C.*, II. 399.

In Virginia the legal protection for individual liberty rested upon the bail law of 1645<sup>1</sup> until the famous extension of the Habeas Corpus Act by Queen Anne. This was embodied in the instructions given to Governor Spotswood, and by him was set forth in the following proclamation, of which a transcript was made from the Virginia Records for this article.

"At a court held in Virginia for the county of Henrico the fifth day of October 1710.

"Virginia SS

"By the Hon<sup>ble</sup> the Lieut Governor

"A Proclamation.

"Whereas her Majesty out of her Royal grace and favour to all her Subjects of this her Colony and Dominion hath been pleased by her Instructions to Signify unto me her Royal Will and pleasure for preserving unto them their legal Rights and propertys which said Instructions are as followeth. Whereas We are above all things desirous that all our Subjects may enjoy their legal Rights and Properties, You are to take especial care that if any person be committed for any Criminal matters (unless for Treason or felony plainly and especially expressed in the Warrant of Commitment) he have free liberty to petition by himself or otherwise the chief Barron or any one of the Judges of the common pleas for a writt of Habeas Corpus which upon such application shall be granted and served on the Provost Marshall Goaler or other Officer having the Custody of such prisoner or shall be left at the Goal or place where the Prisoner is confined and the said Provost Marshall or other Officer Shall within three days after such service (on the petitioners paying the fees and charges and giving Security that he will not escape by the way) make return of the writt and Prisoner before the Judge who granted out the said Writt and there certify the true cause of the Imprisonment and the said Barron or Judge shall discharge Such prisoner taking his Recognizance and Suretys for his appearance at the Court where the offence is cognizable and certify the said Writt and recognizance into the Court unless Such offences appear to the said Barron or Judge notailable by the law of England. And in case the said Barron or Judge shall refuse to grant a Writt of Habeas Corpus on view of the copy of Commitment or upon Oath made of Such copy having been denyed the Prisoner or any person requiring the same in his behalf or shall delay to discharge the Prisoner after the granting of such Writt the said Barron or Judge shall incur the forfeiture of his place. You are likewise to declare our pleasure that in case the Provost Marshall or other officer shall imprison any person above twelve hours except by a Mittimus Setting forth the cause thereof he be removed from his said Office. And upon the application of any person wrongfully committed the Barron or Judge shall issue his warrant to the Provost Marshall or other officer to bring the Prisoner before him who shall be discharged without Bail or paying fees. And the Provost Marshall or other officer refusing obedience to Such Warrant Shall be thereupon removed and if the said Barron or Judge deny his warrant he Shall likewise incur the forfeiture of his place. You Shall give directions that no prisoner being Sett at large by an Habeas Corpus be recommitted for the Same offence but by the Court where he is bound to

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Hening, *Virginia Statutes*, I, 305.



appear and if any Barron or Judge Provost Marshall or other Officer contrary hereunto shall recommit such person so bailed or delivered You are to remove him from his place And if the Provost Marshall or other Officer having the Custody of the Prisoner neglects to return the Habeas Corpus or refuses a copy of the Commitment within Six hours after demand made by the Prisoner or any other in his behalf shall likewise incur the forfeiture of his place And for the better prevention of long imprisonments You are to appoint two Courts of Oyer and Terminer to be held yearly Viz.<sup>1</sup> On the Second Tuesday in December and the Second Tuesday in June the charge whereof to be paid by the Publick Treasury of our said Colony not exceeding £100 each Session. You are to take care that all Prisoners in cases of Treason or Felony have the liberty to petition in open Court for their Tryals that they be Indicted at the first Court of Oyer and Terminer unless it appears upon Oath that the Witnesses against them could not be produced and that they be tryed the Second Court or discharged And the Barron or Judge upon motion made the last day of the sessions in open Court is to bail the Prisoner or upon the refusal of the said Barron or Judge and Provost Marshall or other Officer to do their respective Dutys herein they Shall be removed from their places. Provided always that no person be discharged out of Prison who Stands committed for debt for any Decree of Chancery or for any legal proceedings of any Court of Record. And for the preventing any exactions that may be made upon Prisoners You are to declare our pleasure that no Barron or Judge shall receive for himself or Clerks for granting a Writt of Habeas Corpus more than two Shillings Six pence and the like sum for taking a Recognizance and that the Provost Marshall shall not receive more than five Shillings for every commitment one Shilling three pence for the bond the Prisoner is to Sign one Shilling three pence for every copy of a Mittimus and one Shilling three pence for every mile he bringeth back the Prisoner. In obedience to her Majestys Commands and to the intent that all her subjects may be fully informed how much they owe to her Majestys Royal favour for these her gracious Concessions I Alexander Spotswood Esqr. her Majestys Lieut. Governor of her Colony and Dominion of Virginia have thought fit by and with the advice of her Majestys Council to issue this my Proclamation hereby commanding in her Majestys name the Sheriffs of the respective Countys within this Colony to cause this Signification of her Majestys will and pleasure to be openly read and published at the Court houses of their respective Countys at the next Court after the receipt hereof. And I do further with the advice aforesaid require and command the Justices of the respective County Courts to cause the Same to be Registered in the Records of their Said Countys and to observe these her Majestys Commands as they will answer the contrary at their perill Given at Williamsburgh under my hand and the Seale of the Colony this 6th day of July 1710 in the ninth year of her Majestys Reign.

“God Save the Queen.

“A SPOTSWOOD.

“The afore written Proclamation was ordered to be Recorded and it is accordingly Recorded.

“Teste William Randolph, Cl. Cur.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is certified as a true transcript: “A true transcript from the record, 1902 Jan. 10.—Samuel P. Waddin.”

LIBRARY  
COAST ARTILLERY  
BATTERY

We are now led to inquire concerning the extent of the grant made by this proclamation. In the first place, the legality of the whole proceeding might be questioned, for the instruction was in the nature of a legislative act, whereby the Crown extended an act of Parliament to the colonies. It may well be doubted if the Crown in 1710 possessed any power of this kind, but putting that aside we notice that the only punishment for the failure to carry out the provisions set forth was the removal of the judges, which would depend for its effectiveness upon the governor. This was no special protection against an arbitrary governor. Then again there was the limitation that no one could be discharged if the offenses appeared to be not bailable by the laws of England. Such a clause practically placed the whole thing at the discretion of the judges, who were appointed by the governor. In striking contrast to the feebleness of these penalties, is the English Habeas Corpus Act, which inflicted very heavy fines for failure in execution, and these fines became operative at once on the committing of the offense. The proclamation followed the English law in excluding those held for debt, and added that one held for any decree of chancery, or for any legal proceeding of a court of record should not be released. This addition comes under civil offenses and so is a practical following of the law of England.

Thus Virginia received by questionable means the outward forms of the great Habeas Corpus Act of Charles II., but the effectiveness of the law was greatly hindered by the bail provisions, which placed the whole matter at the discretion of the judges. The Virginians were apparently content to live under the protection so given, for they attempted nothing else till 1736, when they passed a law providing for the use of habeas corpus in cases of civil action. Such legislation anticipated the action of the mother country by nearly a century.

In conclusion, it may be added that the rights of the colonists as regards the writ of habeas corpus rested upon the common law with the exception of South Carolina, which re-enacted the English statute. The lack of statute law did not mean that the colonists had no protection for their personal rights, for the want was supplied by the common law, and also by the placing of habeas corpus provisions in their court laws. Then too they passed very strict bail laws with heavy penalties for their nonfulfilment. Still another protection is to be found in the strong public opinion, so well shown in the hissing of court officers for making insufficient returns. In the majority of the colonies formal habeas corpus acts were not passed until after the American Revolution, when they were free

Y8A9811

Y831178A T2A00

100002

from any hindrance on the part of England. In their legislation, however, there was no violent departure from the law of England, which showed the close relation felt by the colonists in the common inheritance of the English law.

A. H. CARPENTER.

## JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

### II.

On November 13 Adams prepared the usual memorandum of suggestions for the President's annual message at the opening of the session of Congress.<sup>1</sup> He took it to the Executive Mansion and found Monroe "still altogether unsettled in his own mind" on the answer to be given to Canning's proposals, and "alarmed, far beyond anything that I could have conceived possible, with the fear that the Holy Alliance are about to restore immediately all South America to Spain." In this view he was supported by Calhoun, a man who certainly did not err on the side of a cheerful optimism, and the surrender of Cadiz to the French was the immediate cause of this despair. Adams pressed for a decision, either to accept or to decline Canning's advances, and a despatch could then be prepared conformable to either decision.<sup>2</sup> Monroe's vacillation was all the more notable as he had received the counsels of Jefferson and Madison, an episode of which Adams was still in ignorance, for he was not shown the letters until the fifteenth.

If Calhoun was the alarmist member of the Cabinet, Adams was at the other extreme. As well expect Chimborazo to sink beneath the ocean, he believed, as to look to the Holy Alliance to restore the Spanish dominion upon the American continent. If the South Americans really had so fragile governments as Calhoun represented them to be, there was every reason not to involve the United States in their fate. With indecision in the President and dark apprehension in Calhoun, Adams alone held a definite opinion, and in clear phrase he expressed it in summation of the Cabinet discussion :

"I thought we should bring the whole answer to Mr. Canning's proposals to a test of right and wrong. Considering the South Americans

<sup>1</sup> This memorandum is among the Monroe MSS. in the New York Public Library. It consists of four pages of manuscript, and contains nothing on Canning's proposition. I was in the belief that it was an incomplete paper until I found in the Ford collection, in the same library, a rough note in Monroe's writings of "Adams's Sketch," closely following the heads of the Adams manuscript and leaving no doubt of its covering all the points of that paper.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 185.

as independent nations, they themselves, and no other nation, had the *right* to dispose of their condition. *We* have no right to dispose of them, either alone or in conjunction with other nations. Neither have any other nations the right of disposing of them without their consent. This principle will give us a clue to answer all Mr. Canning's questions with candor and confidence, and I am to draft a dispatch accordingly."<sup>1</sup>

At this juncture Russia again intervened. On November 15, Baron de Tuyl communicated to Adams extracts from a despatch received from his court, dated August 30, N. S., containing an exposition of the views of the Emperor Alexander and his allies on the affairs of Spain and Portugal. It was not unusual for the ruler of Russia to take the governments of other countries into his confidence and display before them some of the political principles which controlled his actions or explain some of the motives which actuated his councils. As a member of the Holy Alliance, he was bound by its decisions, and was often made the spokesman of its policy. Such utterances usually took the form of circular letters addressed to the different cabinets of Europe, and, so far as I am able to discover, had not for some years been addressed to the United States. This was only natural, for the United States had deliberately isolated itself from European councils, and could hardly expect to be deemed worthy of being taken into the secret conclaves of the powers dealing with matters on which our representatives were ever asserting they could give no opinion or pledge of action. Further, the very political system of the United States was so opposed to that dominating Europe, that ground for common action could not be found. If England, with her relatively liberal system and many mutual interests with continental Europe, found herself unable to act with the Holy Alliance, it was out of the question for the United States, without any of these interests, to take part in their proceedings. There was every reason for keeping entirely aloof, and, even in a matter that did concern our country, like the negotiations on the slave trade, it was only as a matter of favor that the United States was informed of the conclusions, and as a matter of grace invited to give its adherence to the result. It was, therefore, an unusual incident for the government of the United States to receive from such a source a communication bearing upon the general public policy of Europe. It was difficult to escape the conclusion that some ulterior motive was to be sought. The paper is not accessible, and deserves to be given in full.

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI, 186.



## COUNT NESSELRODE TO BARON TUYLL.

Extrait.

ST. PETERSBOURG le 30. Août, 1823.

Quand les principes qu'une cour a résolu de suivre, sont établis avec précision ; quand le but qu'elle se propose est clairement indiqué, les événements deviennent faciles à juger pour Ses Ministres et Agents diplomatiques. Ceux de l'Empereur n'avaient donc pas besoin d'instructions nouvelles pour apprécier et considérer sous leur vrai point de vue les heureux changements qui viennent de s'accomplir dans la Péninsule.

Pénétrés de l'esprit qui dirige la politique de Sa Majesté Impériale, ils auront applaudi aux déclarations, dont ces changements ont été précédés, exprimé les vœux les plus sincères en faveur d'une entreprise qui embrasse de si hauts intérêts et annoncé sans hésitation que l'Empereur et ses alliés voyaient avec un véritable sentiment de joie, la marche des troupes de S. M. T. C. couronnée d'un double succès par le concours des peuples auxquels l'armée française a offert une généreuse assistance et par l'affranchissement des pays où la révolution était parvenue à détrôner l'autorité légitime.

Aujourd'hui que les artisans des malheurs de l'Espagne, renfermés dans Cadix et dans Barcelone, peuvent bien encore abreuver de nouveaux outrages leurs prisonniers augustes, mais non asservir et tyranniser leur patrie ; aujourd'hui que le Portugal a noblement secoué le joug d'une odieuse faction, nous sommes arrivés à une époque, où il ne sera point inutile de vous informer des décisions et des vues ultérieures de Sa Majesté Impériale.

La force des armes déployée à propos ; environnée de toutes les garanties que réclamait la résolution d'y avoir recours ; tempérée par toutes les mesures et toutes les promesses qui pouvaient tranquilliser les peuples sur leur avenir ; soutenue, enfin, par cette puissance d'union et d'accord qui a créé de nos jours un nouveau système politique : la force des armes n'a eu en quelque sorte qu'à se laisser apercevoir pour démasquer aux yeux du monde un despotisme qu'avaient trop souvent révoqué en doute ou l'erreur des hommes à théories qui s'abusaient involontairement peut-être sur le véritable état des choses, ou la mauvaise foi des hommes à projets criminels qui ne cherchaient que les moyens d'étendre et de propager la contagion des mêmes malheurs.

En Espagne, la nation toute entière attendait impatiemment l'occasion de prouver que la plus coupable imposture avait seule pu lui prêter ces vœux subversifs de l'ordre social et ce désir d'avilir la Religion et le Trône que démentait d'avance chaque page de son histoire. En Portugal, il a suffi d'un exemple et du courage d'un jeune Prince, pour que l'édifice révolutionnaire tombât au premier choc, and pour ainsi dire, de sa propre faiblesse. C'est une grande and consolante leçon que la Providence Divine nous réservait. Elle accorde la justification d'un éclatant triomphe aux desseins des Monarques qui ont pris l'engagement de marcher dans ses voies ; mais peut-être n'a-t-on pas assez observé que les mémorables événements, dont nous sommes témoins, marquent une nouvelle phase de la civilisation Européenne. Sans s'affaiblir, le patriotisme paraît s'être éclairé ; la raison des peuples a fait un grand pas, en reconnaissant que, dans le système actuel de l'Europe, les conquêtes sont impossibles ; que les Souverains qui avaient mis leur gloire à réparer les effets de ces anciennes interventions dont la malveillance essayait encore d'alarmer la crédulité publique, ne renouvelleraient point ce qu'ils avaient toujours condamné, et que ces vieilles haines nationales

qui repoussaient jusqu'aux services rendus par une main étrangère, devaient disparaître devant un sentiment universel, devant le besoin d'opposer une digue impénétrable au retour des troubles et des révolutions dont nous avons tous été, trente ans, les jouets et les victimes. Que l'on compare l'Espagne telle que nous la peignaient des prédictions sinistres, à l'Espagne telle qu'elle se montre aujourd'hui ; que l'on suive les rapides progrès de la bonne cause, depuis l'année dernière, et on se convaincra de ces utiles vérités, on verra que la paix, en se rétablissant, aura pour base la conviction généralement acquise des précieux avantages d'une politique qui a délivré la France, en 1814 et 1815, volé au secours de l'Italie en 1821, brisé les chaînes de l'Espagne et du Portugal en 1823 ; d'une politique, qui n'a pour objet que de garantir la tranquillité de tous les Etats dont se compose le monde civilisé.

Il importe que les Ministres et Agents de l'Empereur ne perdent pas de vue ces graves considérations et qu'ils les développent toutes les fois qu'ils trouvent l'occasion de les faire apprécier.

L'Alliance a été trop calomniée et elle a fait trop de bien pour qu'on ne doive pas confondre ses accusateurs, en plaçant les résultats à côté des imputations, and l'honneur d'avoir affranchi et sauvé les peuples, à côté du reproche de vouloir les asservir et les perdre.

Tout autorise à croire que cette salutaire Alliance accomplira sans obstacle sérieux l'œuvre dont elle s'occupe. La Révolution expirante peut bien compter quelques jours de plus ou de moins d'agonie, mais il lui sera plus difficile que jamais de redevenir Puissance ; car les Monarques Alliés sont décidés à ne pas transiger, à ne pas même traiter avec elle. Certes, ils ne conseilleront, en Espagne, ni les vengeances ni les réactions ; et leur premier principe sera constamment, que l'innocence obtienne une juste garantie et l'erreur un noble pardon ; mais ils ne sauraient reconnaître aucun droit créé et soutenu par le crime ; ils ne sauraient pactiser avec ceux qu'on a vus renouveler à l'isle de Léon, à Madrid et à Séville des attentats qui prouvent le mépris ouvert de tout ce que les hommes devraient respecter le plus dans l'intérêt de leur repos et de leur bonheur. C'est avec cette détermination qu'a été formé et que sera poursuivi le siège de Cadix. On ne posera les armes qu'au moment où la liberté du roi aura enfin été conquise et assurée.

Ce moment sera celui, où les Alliés rempliront envers l'Espagne le reste de leurs engagements et de leurs devoirs. Ils se garderont de porter la plus légère atteinte à l'indépendance du Roi, sous le rapport de l'administration intérieure de ses États, mais par l'organe de leurs Ambassadeurs (Sa Majesté Impériale se propose alors d'accréditer temporairement le Lieutenant Général Pozzo di Borgo auprès de S. M. C.) ils élèveront la voix de l'amitié, ils useront de ses privilèges, ils profiteront de leur position, pour insister avec énergie sur la nécessité d'empêcher que l'avenir ne reproduise les erreurs du passé, de confier à des Institutions fortes, monarchiques et toutes nationales les destinées futures de l'Espagne et de rendre désormais inutile l'assistance qu'elle a reçue, en y fondant un gouvernement dont la sûreté résidera dans le bien même dont il sera l'instrument et l'auteur.

Les Alliés ne pourront signaler ni les lois, ni les mesures, ni les hommes les plus capables de réaliser de telles intentions. Mais ils croiraient manquer à une de leurs obligations les plus essentielles, s'ils n'avertissaient Ferdinand VII, redevenu libre, que leur entreprise demande encore une dernière apologie aux yeux de l'Europe, et que si la

prosperité de l'Espagne n'en est la conséquence immédiate, ils n'auront rien fait ni pour lui, ni pour eux.<sup>1</sup>

L'Empereur souhaite avec la même sincérité et le même désintéressement un bonheur durable à la Nation portugaise. Nos communications jointes à celles des Cours d'Autriche, de France et de Prusse qui partagent ce désir, en offriront la meilleure preuve au Cabinet de Lisbonne, et nous n'aurons plus de vœux à former, si le nouveau gouvernement du Portugal prépare avec prudence et maturité les matériaux d'une restauration solide, s'il les met en œuvre, quand l'Espagne pourra se livrer aux mêmes soins, et s'il rivalise de zèle avec le Cabinet de Madrid pour décider, à l'avantage réciproque des deux Etats, les questions de politique extérieure et administrative, qu'ils ont, l'un et l'autre, à méditer et à résoudre.

Tel est le sens dans lequel ont agi et dans lequel continueront d'agir l'Empereur et ses Alliés. . . .

Vous êtes autorisé à faire usage de la présente dans vos rapports confidentiels avec le gouvernement des États-Unis d'Amérique.<sup>1</sup>

This remarkable manifesto, most appropriate for an autocrat in speaking to other autocrats, but entirely unsuited for gaining the confidence of the "one example of a successful democratic rebellion," naturally influenced Adams in preparing his reply to Canning. The draft of a despatch on all the communications from Rush bearing upon the proposed concert was prepared on November 17, and given to the President on the same day. Whatever may have been the general intention of Adams in preparing this draft, the scope of his policy was greatly enlarged by the communications made by the Russian minister. It was sufficiently aggravating to have been lectured on political principles in the note instructing the minister to make it known that the Emperor would receive no representatives from the late Spanish colonies. The few political remarks in reply included in Adams's note to Baron Tuyll had been ruthlessly cut out by the President, as tending to irritate his Imperial Majesty. From a statement of principle it had been turned, as Adams says, into "the tamest of all State papers." The only consolation was that it entirely satisfied the Russian minister. But now another Russian manifesto had been communicated, explaining more fully, and, it may be added, more offensively, the views and intentions of the Holy Alliance, couched in language which only an autocrat could employ. It was the Holy Alliance proclaiming the virtues and glories of despotism. This gave Adams his opening. If the Emperor set up to be the mouthpiece of Divine Providence, it would be well to intimate that this country did not recognize the language spoken, and had a destiny of its own, also under the guidance of Divine Providence. If Alexander could exploit his political principles, those of a brutal repressive policy, the United States could show that another system of government, re-

<sup>1</sup> Of this paragraph Adams wrote that it was a "satire upon the rest of the paper."

mote and separate from European traditions and administration, could give rise to a new and more active political principle, — the consent of the governed, between which and the Emperor there could not exist even a sentimental sympathy. If the Holy Alliance could boast of its strength and agreement when engaged in stamping out all opposition to legitimacy, the United States, hearing the whisperings of a projected American union, with itself at the head, an Alliance that did not arrogate to itself the epithet of Holy, could demand that the European concert justify its existence, its actions and its motives by records other than the bloody scenes at Naples, in France, and in Spain. Here was Adams's opportunity. It was no longer Canning who was to be answered; it was Europe, — and he seized it as only a masterful man, certain of his ground, can find in the very reasons of his opponent the best of support for his own position.

In the following parallel are given Adams's first draft of the answer to Canning, prepared November 17, and the amendments made by Monroe, November 20.

ADAMS'S DRAFT.<sup>1</sup>

N. 76 RICHARD RUSH, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, U. S., London.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON,  
29 November, 1823.

*Sir*, — Your despatches numbered 323, 325, 326, 330, 331, 332, 334 and 336 have been received, containing the Reports of your Conferences, and copies of your confidential Correspondence with Mr Secretary Canning, in relation to certain proposals made by him tending to a concert of principles, with reference to the Affairs of South America, between the United States and Great Britain, and a combined and candid manifestation of them to the World.

The whole subject has [been] received the deliberate consideration of the President, under a deep impression of its general importance, a full conviction of the high interests and sacred principles involved in it, and an anxious solici-

<sup>1</sup> What is inclosed in brackets of both Adams's and Monroe's papers was omitted in the final form of this despatch.

tude for the cultivation of that harmony of opinions, and unity of object between the British and American Nations, upon which so much of the Peace, and Happiness, and Liberty of the world obviously depend.

I am directed to express to you the President's entire approbation of the course which you have pursued, in referring to your Government the proposals contained in M<sup>r</sup> Canning's private and confidential Letter to you of 20 August. And I am now to signify to you the determination of the President concerning them. A determination which he wishes to be at once candid, explicit, and conciliatory, and which being formed, by referring each of the proposals to the single and unvarying Standard of Right and Wrong, as understood *by us* and maintained by us, will present to the British Government, the whole system of opinions and of purposes of the American Government, with regard to South America.

The first of the *principles* of the British Government, as set forth by M<sup>r</sup> Canning is

"1. We conceive the recovery of the Colonies by Spain to be hopeless."

In this we concur.

The second is

"2. We conceive the question of the Recognition of them as Independent States, to be one of time and circumstances."

We *did* so conceive it, until with a due regard to all the rights of Spain, and with a due sense of our responsibility to the judgment of mankind and of posterity, we had come to the conclusion that the recovery of them by Spain *was* *hopeless*. Having arrived at that conclusion, we considered that the People of those emancipated Colonies, were *of Right*, Independent of all other Nations, and that it was our duty so to acknowledge them. We did so acknowledge them in



March 1822. From which Time the recognition has no longer been a question *to us*. We are aware of considerations just and proper in themselves which might deter Great Britain from fixing upon the same *Time*, for this recognition, with us; but we wish to press it earnestly upon her consideration, whether, after having settled the point that the recovery of the Colonies by Spain was *hopeless* — and after maintaining at the Cannon's mouth, commercial Relations with them, incompatible with their Colonial Condition while subject to Spain, the *moral* obligation does not necessarily result of recognizing them as Independent States.

“3. We are however by no means disposed to throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between them and the mother Country, by *amicable Negotiation*.”

Nor are we. Recognizing them as Independent States we acknowledge them as possessing full power, to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things, which Independent States may of right do. Among these an arrangement between them and Spain, by amicable negotiation is one, which far from being disposed to impede, we would earnestly desire, and by every proper means in our power endeavour to promote provided it should be founded on the basis of Independence.<sup>1</sup> But recognizing them as Independent States, we do and shall justly and [*provided their accommodation with Spain be founded on that basis*] necessarily claim in our relations with them political and commercial to be placed upon a footing of equal favour with the most favoured Nation.

“4. We aim not at the possession of any portion of them ourselves.”

“5. We could not see any por-

<sup>1</sup> This phrase is taken from Monroe's amendments.

MONROE'S AMENDMENTS.  
amendment proposed to first line,  
3<sup>d</sup> pa:  
[“provided their accommodation with Spain was be founded on that basis ”]

tion of them transferred to any other Power, with indifference."

In both these positions we fully concur—And we add

That we could not see with indifference any attempt [by one or more powers of Europe to dispose of the Freedom or Independence of those States, without their consent, or against their will.]

[To this principle, in our view of this subject all the rest are subordinate. Without this, our concurrence with Great-Britain upon all the rest would be useless.] It is upon this ground alone as we conceive that a firm and determined stand could now be jointly taken by Great Britain and the United States in behalf of the *Independence of Nations*, and never in the History of Mankind was there a period when a stand so taken and maintained, would exhibit to present and future ages a more glorious example of Power, animated by Justice and devoted to the ends of beneficence.

[With the addition of this principle, if assented to by the British Government, you are authorised to join in any act formal or informal, which shall manifest the concurrence of the two Governments on this momentous occasion. But you will explicitly state that without this basis of Right and moral obligation, we can see no foundation upon which the concurrent action of the two Governments can be harmonized.

If the destinies of South America, are to be trucked and bartered between Spain and her European Allies, by amicable negotiation, or otherwise, without consulting the feelings or the rights of the People who inhabit that portion of our Hemisphere.]

[The ground of Resistance which we would oppose to any *interference* of the European Allies, between Spain and South America, is not founded on any partial interest of

substitute the following after attempt in 6<sup>th</sup> line.

"any attempt by one or more powers of Europe, to restore those new States, to the crown of Spain, or to deprive them, in any manner whatever, of the freedom and independence which they have acquired, [*Much less could we behold with indifference the transfer of those new gov<sup>ts</sup>, or of any portion of the spanish possessions, to other powers, especially of the territories, bordering on, or nearest to the UStates.*"]

omit in next parag<sup>n</sup> the passage marked and substitute the following—

"with a view to this object, it is indispensable that the British gov<sup>t</sup> take like ground, with that which is now held by the UStates,—that it recognize the independence of the new gov<sup>ts</sup>—That measure being taken, we may then harmonize, in all the [*necessary*] arrangements and acts, which may be necessary for its accomplishment." [*the object.*] It is upon this ground alone, etc. [to the end of the parag<sup>n</sup>.]

omit the residue and substitute something like the following—

["We have no intention of acquiring any portion of the spanish possessions for ourselves, nor shall we ever do it by force. Cuba is that portion, the admission of which into our union, would be the most eligible, but it is the wish of this gov<sup>t</sup>, that it remain, at least for the present, attached to Spain. We have declared this sentiment publicly. and shall continue to act on it. It could not be admitted into our union, unless it should first declare its independence, and that independence should be acknowledged by Spain, events which may not occur for a great length of time, and which the UStates

our own or of others. If the Colonies belonged to Spain we should object to any transfer of them to other Nations, which would materially affect our interests or rights, but with that exception we should consider Spain as possessing the common Power of disposing of her own Territories. Our present opposition to the disposal of any part of the American Continents by Spain, with her European allies is that they do not belong to Spain, and can no more be disposed of by her, than by the United States.

With regard to the Islands of Cuba and Porto-Rico, to the Inhabitants of which the free Constitution of Spain, as accepted and sworn to by the King has been extended, we consider them as possessing the right of determining for themselves their course of conduct, under the subversion of that constitution, by foreign Military power. Our own interest and wish would be that they should continue in their political connection with Spain under the administration of a free Constitution, and in the enjoyment of their Liberties as now possessed; we could not see them transferred to any other Power, or subjected to the antient and exploded dominion of Spain, with indifference. We aim not at the possession of them ourselves.]

I am with great Respect, Sir,  
your very humble and obed<sup>t</sup> Serv<sup>t</sup>

ADAMS'S SUBSTITUTE.

We believe however that for the most effectual [*object*] accomplishment of the object common to both Governments, a perfect understanding with regard to it being established between them, it will be most advisable that they should act separately each making such Representation to the Continental European Allies or either of them, as circumstances may render proper, and mutually communicating to each other the purport of such

will rather discourage than promote.]

On this basis, this gov<sup>t</sup> is willing to move in concert with G. Britain, for the purposes specified.

[with a view however to that object, it [*is submitted*] merits consideration, whether it will not [*be most advantageous to*] contribute most effectually, to its accomplishment, a perfect understanding being established between the two gov<sup>ts</sup>, that they act for the present, & until some eminent danger should occur, separately, each making such representation to the allied powers, or to either of them as shall be deemed most adviseable. Since the receipt of your letters, a communication has been made by Baron T. the Russian minister here, to the following effect. [then state his letter respecting minister etc., and also the informal communication. State also the instructions given to M<sup>r</sup> Middleton, and *those* the purport of those, which will be given to the minister at Paris.] On this subject, it will be proper for you to communicate freely with Mr Canning, as to ascertain fully the sentiments of his gov<sup>t</sup>. He will doubtless be explicit, as to the danger of any movement of the allied powers, or of any, or either of them, for the subjugation, or transfer of any portion of the territory in question, from Spain, to any other power. If there be no such danger, there will be no motive for such concert, and it is only on satisfactory proof of that danger, that you are authorized to provide for it.]

Representations, and all information respecting the measures and purposes of the Allies, the knowledge of which may enlighten the Councils of Great-Britain and of the United States, in this course of policy and towards the honourable end which will be common to them both. Should an emergency occur in which a *joint* manifestation of opinion by the two Governments, may tend to influence the Councils of the European Allies, either in the aspect of persuasion or of admonition, you will make it known to us without delay, and we shall according to the principles of our Government and in the forms prescribed by our Constitution, cheerfully join in any act, by which we may contribute to support the cause of human freedom and the Independence of the South American Nations.

On November 21st these papers were examined in Cabinet meeting. Canning had said that Great Britain would not throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between the colonies and mother country, by amicable negotiation. He would not object to the colonies, under that method, granting to Spain commercial privileges greater than those given to other nations. This did not meet the wishes of Adams, who desired for the United States the footing of the most favored nation. The President did not understand the full meaning of this wish, and proposed a modifying amendment, "which seemed to admit that we should not object to an arrangement by which special favors, or even a restoration of authority, might be conceded to Spain." This was to accept Canning's position to the full, and perhaps even went further, for the restoration of Spanish authority could hardly have occurred to a man who started from the belief that the recovery of the colonies by Spain was hopeless. Both Calhoun and Adams strenuously objected. "The President ultimately acceded to the substance of the phrase as I had in the first instance made the draft; but finally required that the phraseology of it should be varied. Almost all the other amendments proposed by the President were opposed principally by Mr. Calhoun, who most explicitly preferred my last substituted paragraph to the President's projected amendment. The President did not insist upon any of his amendments which were

not admitted by general consent, and the final paper, though considerably varied from my original draft, will be conformable to my own views."<sup>1</sup>

One paper still remained to be answered, and it was really the most important of all—the Emperor's pæan on despotism. Not only was it important as an expression of opinions and policy abhorrent to the American system of government, but it gave Adams the opportunity of making a reply to Europe. Canning's offer of a joint responsibility, limited it must be added to furthering the ends of Great Britain, was no longer to be considered. As an ally of Great Britain the United States would play a very secondary part. Alone, even against united Europe, America could gain the same result and without departing from a policy of avoiding entangling political alliances with any European power. Monroe was willing to raise a European question by aiding Spain and Greece. Adams avoided such a step and changed the issue into an American question, to be determined by America without the interference of any European government, whether English or continental. In this lies the great merit and strength of Adams's position. He lifted the question from one of joint action with England to one of individual action of the United States.

At the Cabinet meeting of November 21, Adams outlined his intended reply to the later communications received from Baron Tuyll, a paper to be first communicated verbally and afterwards delivered to him confidentially. "My purpose would be in a moderate and conciliatory manner, but with a firm and determined spirit, to declare our dissent from the principles avowed in those communications; to assert those upon which our own Government is founded, and, while disclaiming all intention of attempting to propagate them by force, and all interference with the political affairs of Europe, to declare our expectation and hope that the European powers will equally abstain from the attempt to spread their principles in the American hemisphere, or to subjugate by force any part of these continents to their will."<sup>2</sup>

While the President approved this idea, his first draft of his message to Congress showed that he had not comprehended the general drift of the Secretary's intentions in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. In calling the Cabinet meeting for the 21st he had included among the questions to be considered "whether any, and if any, what notice, shall be taken of

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 193.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 194.



Greece, and also of the invasion of Spain by France."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly his draft alluded to recent events in Spain and Portugal, "speaking in terms of the most pointed reprobation of the late invasion of Spain by France, and of the principles upon which it was undertaken by the open avowal of the King of France. It also contained a broad acknowledgment of the Greeks as an independent nation."<sup>2</sup> Where was the future Monroe doctrine in all this? It was, as Adams said, a call to arms against all Europe, and for objects of policy exclusively European—Greece and Spain. Protest only led the President to promise to draw up two sketches for consideration, conformable to the two different aspects of the subject. He was ready to adopt either, as his Cabinet might advise. Nothing could better prove how the essential part of Adams's views had escaped Monroe's attention. On the next day the Secretary again urged Monroe to abstain from everything in his message which the Holy Alliance could make a pretext for construing into aggression upon them. He should end his administration—"hereafter to be looked back to as the golden age of this republic"—in peace. If the Holy Alliance were determined to make up an issue with the United States, "it was our policy to meet it, and not to make it. . . . If they intend now to interpose by force, we shall have as much as we can do to prevent them, without going to bid them defiance in the heart of Europe."<sup>3</sup> And Adams again stated the heart of his desired policy in unmistakable words: "The ground that I wish to take is that of earnest remonstrance against the interference of the European powers by force with South America, but to disclaim all interference on our part with Europe; to make an American cause and adhere inflexibly to that." In Gallatin, Adams found a congenial spirit on every point save that of the Greeks; and Gallatin talked with Monroe. The result of the urgency of these two men was that the President modified his paragraphs on foreign affairs, and made them conformable to the spirit of Adams's position. The result is to be seen in the Presidential message of December 2,

<sup>1</sup> JAMES MONROE TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

*Dear Sir,*—I have given notice to the other members of the adm<sup>y</sup>, who are present, to meet here at one o'clock, at which time you will bring over the draught of the instruction to Mr. Rush for consideration. I mean to bring under consideration, at the same time, the important question, whether any, and if any, what notice, shall be taken of Greece, and also of the invasion of Spain by France. With a view to the latter object, be so good as to bring over with you, a copy of the King's Speech, to the legislative corps, announcing the intended invasion.

J. M.

—Adams MSS

Nov<sup>r</sup> 21. 1823.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 194.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 197.

1823, enunciating the doctrine that has since gone under the name of Monroe.

Adams had prepared the draft of his reply to the Russian communication, as he thought, in such a manner as to "correspond exactly with a paragraph of the President's message which he had read to me yesterday, and which was entirely conformable to the system of policy which I have earnestly recommended for this emergency." It was intended to be a firm, spirited, and yet conciliatory answer to all the communications lately received from the Russian government, and at the same time an unequivocal answer to the proposals made by Canning to Rush.

"It was meant also to be eventually an exposition of the principles of this Government, and a brief development of its political system as henceforth to be maintained: essentially republican, maintaining its own independence, and respecting that of others; essentially pacific—studiously avoiding all involvement in the combinations of European politics, cultivating peace and friendship with the most absolute monarchies, highly appreciating and anxiously desirous of retaining that of the Emperor Alexander, but declaring that having recognized the independence of the South American States, we could not see with indifference any attempt by European powers by forcible interposition either to restore the Spanish dominion on American Continents or to introduce monarchical principles into those countries, or to transfer any portion of the ancient or present American possessions of Spain to any other European Power."<sup>1</sup>

How far these intentions were fulfilled a careful study of the paper itself will show. Like all of Adams's papers it is clearly expressed and most direct to the point.

Observations on the Communications recently received from the Minister of Russia.<sup>2</sup>

The Government of the United States of America is *Republican*. By their Constitution it is provided that "The United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union, a *Republican* form of Government, and shall protect each of them from invasion.

[The principles of this form of Polity are; 1 that the Institution of Government, to be lawful, must be pacific, that is founded upon the consent, and by the agreement of those who are governed; and 2 that each Nation is exclusively the judge of the Government best suited to itself, and that no other Nation, can justly interfere by force to impose a different Government upon it. The first of these principles may be designated, as the principle of *Liberty*—the second as the principle of *National Independence*—They are both Principles of *Peace* and of Good Will to Men.]

[A necessary consequence of the second of these principles is that] The United States recognize in other Nations the right which they claim and exercise for themselves, of establishing and of modifying their own

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 199, 200.

<sup>2</sup> What is enclosed between brackets was struck out of the paper.

Governments, according to their own judgments, and views of their interests, not encroaching upon the rights of others.

Aware that the Monarchical principle of Government, is different from theirs the United States, have never sought a conflict with it, for interests not their own. Warranted by the principle of National Independence, which forms one of the bases of their political Institutions, they have desired Peace, Commerce and Honest Friendship with all other Nations, and entangling alliances with none.

From all the combinations of European Politics relative to the distribution of Power, or the Administration of Government the United States have studiously kept themselves aloof. They have not sought, by the propagation of their principles to disturb the Peace, or to intermeddle with the policy of any part of Europe. In the Independence of Nations, they have respected the organization of their Governments, however different from their own, and [Republican to the last drop of blood in their veins], they have thought it no sacrifice of their principles to cultivate with sincerity and assiduity Peace and Friendship even with the most absolute Monarchies and their Sovereigns.

To the Revolution and War which has severed the immense Territories, on the american [*Territories*] continents heretofore subject to the dominion of Spain from the yoke of that power, the United States have observed an undeviating neutrality. So long as the remotest prospect existed that Spain by Negotiation or by arms could recover the possession she had once held of those Countries, the United States forbore to enquire by what title she had held them, and how she had fulfilled towards them the duties of all Governments to the People under their charge. When the South-American Nations, after successively declaring their Independence, had maintained it, until no rational doubt could remain, that the dominion of Spain over them was irrecoverably lost, the United States recognized them as Independent Nations, and have entered into those relations with them commercial and political incident to that Condition—Relations the more important to the interests of the United States, as the whole of those emancipated Regions are situated in their own Hemisphere, and as the most extensive, populous and powerful of the new Nations are in their immediate vicinity; and one of them bordering upon the Territories of this Union.

To the contest between Spain and South America all the European Powers have also remained neutral. The maritime Nations have freely entered into commercial intercourse with the South-Americans, which they could not have done, while the Colonial Government of Spain existed. The neutrality of Europe was one of the foundations upon which the United States formed their judgment, in recognizing the South-American Independence; they considered and still consider, that from this neutrality the European Nations cannot rightfully depart.

Among the Powers of Europe, Russia is one with whom the United States have entertained the most friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse. Through all the vicissitudes of War and Revolution, of which the world for the last thirty years has been the theatre, the good understanding between the two Governments has been uninterrupted. The Emperor Alexander in particular has not ceased to manifest sentiments of Friendship and good-will to the United States from the period of his accession to the throne, to this moment, and the United States on their part, have as invariably shown the interest which they take in his Friendship and the solicitude with which they wish to retain it.

In the communications recently received from the Baron de Tuyll, so far as they relate to the immediate objects of intercourse between the two Governments, the President sees with high satisfaction, the avowal of unabated cordiality and kindness towards the United States on the part of the Emperor.

With regard to the communications which relate to the Affairs of Spain and Portugal, and to those of South America, while sensible of the candour and frankness with which they are made, the President indulges the hope, that they are not intended *either* to mark an *Æra* either of change, in the friendly dispositions of the Emperor towards the United States or of hostility to the principles upon which their Governments are founded; or of deviation from the system of neutrality hitherto observed by him and his allies, in the contest between Spain and America.

To the Notification that the Emperor, in conformity with the *political principles* maintained by himself and his Allies, has determined to receive no Agent from any of the Governments *de facto*, which have been recently formed in the new World it has been thought sufficient to answer that the United States, faithful to *their* political principles, have recognised and now consider them as the Governments of Independent Nations.

To the signification of the Emperor's hope and desire that the United States should continue to observe the neutrality which they have proclaimed between Spain and South-America, the answer has been that the Neutrality of the United States will be maintained, as long as that of Europe, apart from Spain, shall continue and that they hope that of the Imperial Government of Russia will be continued.

[To the confidential communication from the Baron de Tuyll, of the Extract, dated St Petersburg 30 August 1823. So far as it relates to the affairs of Spain and Portugal, the only remark which it is thought necessary to make, is of the great satisfaction with which the President has noticed *that* paragraph, which contains the frank and solemn admissions that "*the undertaking of the Allies, yet demands a last Apology to the eyes of Europe.*" ]

In the general declarations that the allied Monarchs will never compound, and never will even treat with the *Revolution* and that their policy has only for its object by *forcible* interposition to guaranty the tranquillity of *all the States of which the civilised world is composed*, the President wishes to perceive sentiments, the application of which is limited, and intended in their results to be limited to the Affairs of Europe.

That the sphere of their operations was not intended to embrace the United States of America, nor any portion of the American Hemisphere.

And finally deeply desirous as the United States are of preserving the general peace of the world, their friendly intercourse with all the European Nations, and especially the most cordial harmony and goodwill with the Imperial Government of Russia, it is due as well to their own unalterable Sentiments, as to the explicit avowal of them, called for by the communications received from the Baron de Tuyll, to declare

That the United States of America, and their Government, could not see with indifference, the forcible interposition of any European Power, other than Spain, either to restore the dominion of Spain over her emancipated Colonies in America, or to establish Monarchical Governments in those Countries, or to transfer any of the possessions heretofore

or yet subject to Spain in the American Hemisphere, to any other European Power.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE WASHINGTON, 27 November, 1823

When Adams laid before the Cabinet on the twenty-fifth, this draft of his paper, much discussion and opposition were developed. The timidity of Monroe was aroused, and the other members of the Cabinet hesitated. Calhoun questioned whether it would be proper to deliver any such paper to the Russian minister; it contained an ostentatious display of republican principles, might be offensive to the Russian government, and even to that of Great Britain, which would by no means relish so much republicanism. The President's message would be sufficient. "It was a mere communication to our own people. Foreign powers might not feel themselves bound to notice what was said in that. It was like a family talking over subjects interesting to them by the fireside among themselves. Many things might be said there without offense, even if a stranger should come among them and overhear the conversation, which would be offensive if they went to his house to say them."<sup>1</sup>

Wirt, the Attorney-General, raised the point whether the United States would be justified in taking so broadly the ground of resistance to the interposition of the Holy Alliance by force to restore the Spanish dominion in South America. If the Holy Alliance should act in direct hostility against South America, would this country oppose them by war? There was danger in assuming the attitude of menace without meaning to strike. But Adams, while admitting the remote possibility of war, saw no immediate prospect of that event: "The interest of no one of the allied powers would be promoted by the restoration of South America to Spain; that the interest of each one of them was against it, and that if they could possibly agree among themselves upon a partition principle, the only possible bait they could offer to Great Britain for acceding to it was Cuba, which neither they nor Spain would consent to give her; that my reliance upon the co-operation of Great Britain rested not upon her principles, but her interest."<sup>2</sup>

Calhoun was filled with gloomy apprehensions. Having subdued South America, the Allies would turn their attention to the United States, "to put down what had been called the first example of successful democratic rebellion." By taking a firm stand now these intentions might be frustrated, even at the expense of war. And he repeated his suggestion of answering the Russian commu-

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 200.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 203.

nications by the paragraph in the Presidential message. To this Adams gave a conclusive reply.

"The communications from the Russian Minister required a direct and explicit answer. A communication of the paragraph in the President's message would be no answer, and if given as an answer would certainly be very inconsistent with the position that foreigners have no right to notice it, because it was all said among ourselves. This would be precisely as if a stranger should come to me with a formal and insulting display of his principles in the management of his family and his conduct towards his neighbors, knowing them to be opposite to mine, and as if I, instead of turning upon him and answering him face to face, should turn to my own family and discourse to them upon my principles and conduct, with sharp innuendoes upon those of the stranger, and then say to him, 'There! take that for your answer. And yet you have no right to notice it; for it was only said to my own family, and behind your back.'"<sup>1</sup>

For three days the discussion was continued, and resulted finally in a victory for Adams, but at the expense of two paragraphs of his draft—those indicated by the brackets. The Secretary fought well to have them retained, and thought the first of them to be the "heart of his paper." From the principles there given "all the remainder of the paper was drawn. Without them, the rest was a fabric without a foundation." The President<sup>2</sup> was fearful, and Wirt described the paragraph as a "hornet of a paragraph, and, he thought, would be exceedingly offensive." Adams in reply could only say that it was the "cream of my paper," but he felt that the President would not let it pass. Monroe, after forty-eight hours of consideration, gave an opinion:

Nov<sup>r</sup> 27 [1823.]

The direct attack which the parag<sup>h</sup> makes on the recent movements, of the Emperor, and of course, censure, on him, and its tendency to irritate, suggest the apprehension that it may produce an unfavorable effect. The illustration of our principles, is one thing; the doing it, in such a form, bearing directly, on what has passed, and which is avoided in the message, is another. Nevertheless, as you attach much interest to this passage, I am willing that you insert it, being very averse to your omitting anything w<sup>ch</sup> you deem so material.

J. M.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI, 208.

<sup>2</sup> JAMES MONROE TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Dear Sir,—I am inclin'd to think that the second parag<sup>h</sup> had better be omitted, and that such part of the 3<sup>d</sup> be also omitted, as will make that parag<sup>h</sup> stand, as the second distinct proposition, in our system. The principle of the paper, will not be affected by this modification, and it will be less likely to produce excitement anywhere.

Two other passages, the first in the first page, and the second, in the 3<sup>d</sup> are also marked for omission.

J. M.

You had better see the Baron immediately.

Nov<sup>r</sup> 27, 1823.

<sup>3</sup> From the Adams MSS.



But Adams did not include the paragraph, and in an incomplete shape the paper was read to Baron Tuyll.

In a despatch dated November 30, Adams explained to Rush more fully the attitude of the administration on Canning's proposals, making a general résumé of the questions raised, and advancing statements which could not with propriety have been included in a paper intended to be shown to the British minister. He asserted even more distinctly than did the message that American affairs, whether of the northern or of the southern continent, cannot be left "at the disposal of European Powers animated and directed exclusively by European principles and interests." As an exposition of the Monroe doctrine this despatch deserves to rank with the later utterances of Adams, when as President it became necessary to define more clearly the limits of interference or protection to be observed.

No. 77. RICHARD RUSH: Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary U. S. London.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE WASHINGTON 30 November, 1823.

SIR,—The Instructions contained in my Letter dated yesterday were given with a view to enable you to return an explicit answer to the proposals contained in Mr. Secretary Canning's confidential Letter to you of the 20<sup>th</sup> of August last. The object of this despatch is to communicate to you the views of the President with regard to a more general consideration of the affairs of South America; to serve for your government, and to be used according to your discretion, in any further intercourse which you may have with the British Cabinet on this subject.

In reviewing the proposals of Mr. Canning and the discussion of them in your Correspondence and Conferences, the President has with great satisfaction adverted to them, in the light of an *overture* from the British Government, towards a confidential concert of opinions and of operations between us and them, with reference to the countries heretofore subject to Spain in this Hemisphere. In the exposition of the *principles* of the British Government, as expressed in the five positions of Mr. Canning's Letter, we perceive nothing, with which we cannot cheerfully concur with the exception of that which still considers the recognition of the Independence of the Southern Nations, as a question of Time and Circumstances. Confident as we are that the Time is at hand, when Great Britain, to preserve her own consistency must come to this acknowledgment, we are aware that she may perhaps be desirous of reserving to herself the *whole* merit of it with the South-Americans, and that she may finally yield more readily to the decisive act of recognition, when appearing to be spontaneous, than when urged upon her by *any* foreign suggestion. The point itself has been so earnestly pressed in your correspondence and conferences with Mr. Canning, and is so explicitly stated in my despatch of yesterday as *indispensable*, in our view towards a co-operation of the two Governments, upon this important interest, that the President does not think it necessary that you should dwell upon it with much solicitude. The objections exhibited

by Mr. Canning against the measure as stated particularly in your despatches are so feeble, and your answers to them so conclusive, that after the distinct avowal of our sentiments, it may perhaps best conduce to the ultimate *entire* coincidence of purposes between the two Governments to leave the choice of *Time* for the recognition, which Mr. Canning has reserved to the exclusive consideration of the British Ministers themselves.

We receive the proposals themselves, and all that has hitherto passed concerning them, according to the request of Mr. Canning as *confidential*. As a first advance of that character, which has ever been made by the British Government, in relation to the *foreign* affairs between the two Nations, we would meet it with cordiality, and with the true spirit of confidence, which is candour. The observations of Mr. Canning in reply to your remark, that the policy of the United States has hitherto been, entirely distinct and separate from all interference in the complications of European Politics, have great weight, and the considerations involved in them, had already been subjects of much deliberation among ourselves. As a member of the European community Great Britain has relations with all the other powers of Europe, which the United States have not, and with which it is their unaltered determination, not to interfere. But American Affairs, whether of the Northern or of the Southern Continent *can* henceforth not be excluded from the interference of the United States. All questions of policy relating to them have a bearing so direct upon the Rights and Interests of the United States themselves, that they cannot be left at the disposal of European Powers animated and directed exclusively by European principles and interests. Aware of the deep importance of united ends and councils, with those of Great Britain in this emergency, we see no possible basis on which that harmonious concert of measures can be founded, other than the general principle of South-American Independence. So long as Great Britain withholds the recognition of that, we may, as we certainly do concur with her in the aversion to the transfer to any other power of any of the colonies in this Hemisphere, heretofore, or yet belonging to Spain; but the principles of that aversion, so far as they are common to both parties, resting only upon a casual coincidence of interests, in a National point of view *selfish* on both sides, would be liable to dissolution by every change of phase in the aspects of European Politics. So that Great Britain negotiating at once with the European Alliance, and *with us*, concerning America, without being bound by any permanent community of principle, [but only by a casual coincidence of interest with us,<sup>1</sup>] would still be free to accommodate her policy to any of those distributions of power, and partitions of Territory which have for the last half century been the ultima ratio of all European political arrangements. While we, bound to her by engagements, commensurate only with the momentary community of our separate particular interests, and self-excluded from all Negotiation with the European Alliance, should still be liable to see European Sovereigns dispose of American interests, without consulting either with us, or with any of the American Nations, over whose destinies they would thus assume an arbitrary superintendence and controul.

It was stated to you by Mr. Canning that in the event of a proposal for a European Congress, to determine upon measures relating to South

<sup>1</sup> The words enclosed have been struck out in pencil, as evidently a repetition of what had been already expressed.

America, he should propose, that you, as the Representative of the United States, should be invited to attend at the same; and that in the case, either of a refusal to give you that invitation or of your declining to accept it if given, Great Britain would reserve to herself the right of declining also to attend. The President approves your determination not to attend, in case the invitation should be given; and we are not aware of any circumstances under which we should deem it expedient that a Minister of the United States should be authorized to attend at such a Congress if the invitation to that effect should be addressed to this Government itself. We should certainly decline attending unless the South-American Governments should also be invited to attend by *their* Representatives, and as the Representatives of Independent Nations. We would not sanction by our presence any meeting of European Potentates to dispose of American Republics. We shall if such meeting should take place, with a view to any result of hostile action solemnly protest against it, and against all the melancholy and calamitous consequences which may result from it. We earnestly hope that Great Britain will do the same.

It has been observed that through the whole course of the Correspondence and of the Conferences, between Mr. Canning and you, he did not disclose the specific information upon which he apprehended so immediate an interposition of the European Allies, in the affairs of South-America, as would have warranted or required the measure which he proposed to be taken in concert with you, before this Government could be advised of it. And this remark has drawn the more attention, upon observing the apparent coolness and apparent indifference, with which he treated the subject at your last conferences after the peculiar earnestness and solemnity of his first advances. It would have been more satisfactory here, and would have afforded more distinct light for deliberation, if the confidence in which his proposals originated had at once been entire. This suggestion is now made with a view to the future; and to manifest the disposition on our part to meet and return confidence without reserve.

The circumstances of Mr. Gallatin's private concerns having induced him to decline returning to Europe at this time, and the posture of Affairs requiring in the opinion of the President the immediate renewal of Negotiations with France, Mr. James Brown has been appointed to that Mission, and is expected very shortly to proceed upon it.

I am with great Respect etc.

[JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.]<sup>1</sup>

With the submission to Congress on December 2d of the President's annual message, the incident was closed so far as the public utterance of the doctrine was concerned. The message, the two despatches to Rush, and the communication made to the Russian minister crossed the ocean at the same time, and Great Britain was the first of the European powers to know how far the United States had gone in declaring an independent action on South American concerns. The effect was immediate. The stocks of all South American countries rose in the market — one of the most delicate measures of public opinion. Rush wrote on December 27th:

<sup>1</sup> From the Adams MSS.

"But the most decisive blow to all despotick interference with the new States is that which it has received in the President's Message at the opening of Congress. It was looked for here with extraordinary interest at this juncture, and I have heard that the British packet which left New York the beginning of this month was instructed to wait for it and bring it over with all speed. It is certain that this vessel first brought it, having arrived at Falmouth on the 24th instant. On its publicity in London which followed as soon afterwards as possible the credit of all the Spanish American securities immediately rose, and the question of the final and complete safety of the new States from all European coercion, is now considered as at rest."

It now remains to give some further evidence of the position of Monroe. The steps by which he was induced to modify his views to accord with those of Adams have been given, and it is seen that as late as November 13th he was entirely unsettled what answer to make to Canning's propositions; that in the draft of his message he had shown a marked failure to grasp the full meaning of Adams's arguments and was prepared to enter into European politics on a question entirely European; and that only a few days before the message was sent to Congress did he change his views of the relations of the United States to Europe so as to conform with those of his Secretary of State. While Adams looked upon the matter as closed, and must have felt the full force of his victory in making the influence of the United States thus felt in Europe, Monroe still entertained fears. On sending a copy of the message to Jefferson he wrote on December 4th:

"I have concurr'd thoroughly with the sentiments expressd in your late letter, as I am persuaded, you will find, by the message, as to the part we ought to act, toward the allied powers, in regard to S<sup>o</sup>. America. I consider the cause of that country, as essentially our own. That the crisis is fully as menacing, as has been supposed, is confirmd, by recent communications, from another quarter, with which I will make you acquainted in my next. The most unpleasant circumstance, in these communications is, that Mr. Canning's zeal, has much abated of late. Whether this proceeds, from the unwillingness of his gov<sup>t</sup>, to recognize the new gov<sup>t</sup>, or from offers made to it, by the allied powers, to seduce it, into their scale, we know not. We shall nevertheless be on our guard, against any contingency."<sup>1</sup>

To his son-in-law, Samuel L. Gouverneur, he wrote on the same day, in a like apprehensive tone, as though the country had to fear a grave danger, evidently a remaining trace of the feeling that prompted the first draft of his message. Always rather formal in his manner of expressing his thoughts, he is even more than formal when striving to strike a note of profound import.

"I send you two copies of the message, better printed than that which I sent yesterday, with the information, which we possess, of the

<sup>1</sup> From the Jefferson MSS.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. VIII.—4.

views of the allied powers, which altho' applicable to S<sup>o</sup> am :, touch us, on principle, it was thought a duty to advert to the subject, and in plain terms. It has been done, nevertheless, in mild, respectful, and friendly terms. Had I omitted to put the country on its guard, and any thing had occurrd of a serious character, I should probably have been censured as it is they may look before them, and what may be deemed expedient. I shall be glad to hear in what light the warning is viewd."<sup>1</sup>

A few days later he wrote more fully to Jefferson, and the letter is of sufficient importance to be given in full, for it shows that at last the President is reaching a better understanding of Adams's position.

MONROE TO JEFFERSON.

WASHINGTON, Dec<sup>r</sup>, 1823.

DEAR SIR,—Shortly after the receipt of yours of the 24<sup>th</sup> of October, and while the subject treated in it, was under consideration, the Russian minister, drew the attention of the gov<sup>t</sup> to the same subject, tho' in a very different sense from that in which it had been done by Mr. Canning. Baron Tuyl, announced in an official letter, and as was understood by order of the Emperor, that having heard that the republic of Columbia had appointed a minister to Russia, he wished it to be distinctly understood that he would not receive him, nor would he receive any minister from any of the new gov<sup>ts</sup> de facto, of which the new world had been recently the theatre. On another occasion, he observ'd, that the Emperor had seen with great satisfaction, the declaration of this gov<sup>t</sup>, when those new gov<sup>ts</sup> were recognized, that it was the intention of the UStates, to remain neutral. He gave this intimation for the purpose of expressing the wish of his master, that we would persevere in the same policy. He communicated soon afterwards, an extract of a letter from his gov<sup>t</sup>, in which the conduct of the allied powers, in regard to Naples, Spain, and Portugal, was reviewed, and that policy explain'd, distinctly avowing their determination, to crush all revolutionary movements, and thereby to preserve order in the civilized world. The terms "civilized world" were probably intended to be applied to Europe only, but admitted an application to this hemisphere also. These communications were receivd as proofs of candour, and a friendly disposition to the U States, but were nevertheless answer'd, in a manner equally explicit, frank, and direct, to each point. In regard to neutrality it was observ'd, when that sentim<sup>t</sup> was declar'd, that the other powers of Europe had not taken side with Spain—that they were then neutral—if they should change their policy, the state of things, on which our neutrality was declar'd, being alterd, we would not be bound by that declaration, but might change our policy also.<sup>2</sup> Informal notes, or rather a proces verbal, of what passed in conference, to such effect, were exchanged between Mr Adams and the Russian minister, with an understanding however that they should be held confidential.

When the character of these communications, of that from Mr. Canning, and that from the Russian minister, is considered, and the time when made, it leaves little doubt that some project against the new gov<sup>ts</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> From the Monroe MSS. in the New York Public Library.

<sup>2</sup> To this point in thick lines; showing a change of pen, and presumably a change in time, what follows being written at a later day.

is contemplated. In what form is uncertain. It is hoped that the sentiments expressed in the message, will give a check to it. We certainly meet, in full extent, the proposition of Mr. Canning, and in the mode to give it the greatest effect. If his gov<sup>t</sup> makes a similar decl<sup>n</sup>, the project will, it may be presumed, be abandoned. By taking the step here, it is done in a manner more conciliatory with, and respectful to Russia, and the other powers, than if taken in England, and as it is thought with more credit to our gov<sup>t</sup>. Had we mov'd in the first instance in England, separated as she is in part, from those powers, our union with her, being marked, might have produced irritation with them. We know that Russia, dreads a connection between the UStates and G. Britain, or harmony in policy. Moving on our own ground, the apprehension that unless she retreats, that effect may be produced, may be a motive with her for retreating. Had we mov'd in England, it is probable, that it would have been inferr'd that we acted under her influence, and at her instigation, and thus have lost credit as well with our southern neighbours, as with the allied powers.

There is some danger that the British gov<sup>t</sup>, when it sees the part we have taken, may endeavour to throw the whole burden on us, and profit, in case of such interposition of the allied powers; of her neutrality, at our expense. But I think that this would be impossible after what has passd on the subject; besides it does not follow, from what has been said, that we should be bound to engage in the war, in such event. Of this intimations may be given, should it be necessary. A messenger will depart for Engl<sup>d</sup> with despatches for Mr. Rush in a few days, who will go on to St Petersburg with others to Mr. Middleton. And considering the crisis, it has occur'd, that a special mission, of the first consideration from the country, directed to Engl<sup>d</sup> in the first instance, with power, to attend, any congress, that may be conven'd, on the affrs of S<sup>o</sup> am: or Mexico, might have the happiest effect. You shall hear from me further onthis subject.

Very sincerely your friend

[no signature.]

Endorsed "rec<sup>d</sup> Dec. 11."<sup>1</sup>

With this letter I may close the present paper, leaving to a subsequent study the development of the doctrine given by Adams while President. That the authorship of what passes under the name of the Monroe doctrine belonged to Adams has been surmised by all who have treated of the occasion of the first utterances. Plumer, a contemporary, claimed the credit for Adams; Dr. Welling, no mean authority in such matters, as he went back to original sources as far as possible, asserted it as his conclusion; and Reddaway does the same. But none of those writers knew of the papers now used for the first time, papers that have slumbered in the archives at Quincy, where they have been so carefully preserved. They illuminate the pages of the *Memoirs* covering this period, and while permitting us to interpret the sentences of that record, they also bring forcibly before us the part that Adams played in not

<sup>1</sup> From the Jefferson MSS. in the Department of State, Washington, D. C.



only framing an American policy, but in forcing its acceptance upon an unwilling and fearsome President and Cabinet. It is useless to speculate upon what might have been the course pursued had Adams not been where he was. Monroe's career was one series of blunders and failures, a succession of performances which would have ruined any man not resting upon a tradition, a party and a state. He had undone himself in France under Washington ; in France and England under Jefferson he had been discredited ; in Spain he had failed ; and in the war of 1812 he had done nothing. That such a man could have stood up against Europe alone is inconceivable, and there was no person in the Cabinet, except Adams, who would have given him support in such measure. To originate the idea, to carry it in the face of all opposition, to bring Monroe to its support and make him the spokesman—this was distinctly the work of Adams. It is needless to seek for the paragraphs of Monroe's message embodying this doctrine in the expectation of finding them in Adams's writing. It is enough to follow the course of events in the light of these new state papers to know that the Monroe doctrine was the work of John Quincy Adams.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

## LINCOLN AND THE PATRONAGE<sup>1</sup>

THE inauguration of Lincoln has for us so tragic and so critical an aspect, that we find it difficult to put ourselves in the place of the average politician of the day, to whom it was chiefly interesting, as affording an opportunity for plunder, or as bringing, almost, a certainty of removal. No sooner were the election returns in, than Springfield filled with anxious crowds,<sup>2</sup> and during the nine days which he spent in Washington, as President-elect, Lincoln was pursued by applicants, as eager as if there were no doubt about the stability of the government they wished to serve.<sup>3</sup> To those who were present in the flesh must be added thousands who confided their desires to the post, and, according to his degree, every Republican of prominence was deluged with requests, modest and pretentious,<sup>4</sup> some accompanied by bribes,<sup>5</sup> others supported by an appeal to pity,<sup>6</sup> or a claim for reward.<sup>7</sup> It was a motley crowd; western lawyers mingled with the drill sergeants of Weed's organization, while some sturdy workers against slavery thought that their disinterested constancy might now receive an earthly crown.<sup>8</sup> A new party had come into power, eager to break its fast, and feast on the good things that the administration had to dispense.

Richard Henry Dana wrote to Charles Francis Adams, March 9, 1863, of Lincoln: "He seems to me to be fonder of details than of principles, of tithing the mint, anise and cummins of patronage, and personal questions, than of the weightier matters of empire."<sup>9</sup> Lincoln himself deeply lamented the time devoted to these petty

<sup>1</sup> This article is a by-product of a work on the history of the patronage. Lincoln's administration is not particularly significant, from the point of view of development, but is rich in materials. It, therefore, seemed worth while, considering also the intrinsic interest of everything that relates to Lincoln, to prepare a fuller treatment of this period than just proportion would permit in the completed work.

<sup>2</sup> Lamon, *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, 457.

<sup>3</sup> Tarbell, *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, I. 423.

<sup>4</sup> Chase MSS. I have read several thousand such letters, for the period 1860-1865. See also Hollister, *Life of Schuyler Colfax*, 173. Almost any biography or volume of recollections gives like evidence.

<sup>5</sup> Riddle, *Recollections of War Times*, 21.

<sup>6</sup> Chase MSS., *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> A typical letter is one to Chase, Nov. 24, 1863. Chase MSS.

<sup>8</sup> *New York Tribune*, March 19, 1861. ——— to Chase, Dec. 15, 1862. Chase MSS. C. M. Clay, *Autobiography*, I. 252-257.

<sup>9</sup> Adams, *Richard Henry Dana*, II. 264.

matters,<sup>1</sup> when great issues demanded his attention, although, as always, he saw the humorous side of the situation,<sup>2</sup> and gained a goodly supply of stories, from his experiences in dealing with them. Regrettable as was this constant distraction, the importance of the work must not be underrated. The situation demanded a politician, as well as a statesman, and had Lincoln been the latter only, he would have failed in his task. If he could not have held the Republican party together, he would have formulated statesmanlike policies in vain; and that he held it together was quite largely due to such use of the public plunder that its cohesive power was felt to the uttermost. The purely political problem before Lincoln, using "political" in the narrow American sense of the word, was a more difficult one than any that had confronted previous Presidents.

Scores of diverse elements, each thinking that its labors had been the most effective, had to be kept together in the moment of victory. The sharing of the spoils revived the old enmities, which had been temporarily lost sight of in the heat of the conflict. Democrat abhorred Whig, and both still looked on the Abolitionist as dangerous, while a rumor that Lincoln would try to conciliate the border states by appointing "Bell-Everetts" in that region caused consternation.<sup>3</sup> The *Tribune* said: "Of course, they must alienate many by their distribution of the patronage; were they angels they could not fail to do this."<sup>4</sup> That the party remained solid throughout the war, and that the war Democrats so loyally supported the Union was, to be sure, mainly due to the nature of the issue, but the time that Lincoln spent in trying to "do justice to all"<sup>5</sup> was not wasted. To entrust similar functions to favorites, is deemed blameworthy in a King, or in a President when he entrusts them to a boss. Lincoln seems to have fallen into the temptation, thus to shift the task to other shoulders. He told a visitor at Springfield that he would call an adviser, when the proper time came, and would go over the most important cases with him, and would have little or nothing to do with minor posts,<sup>6</sup> but fortunately he changed his mind before the trial came, and did not shirk this arduous but necessary duty.

The consensus of public opinion, in no uncertain tones, formulated the principles which should be followed in regard to the civil service. These were the halcyon days of the spoils system; but

<sup>1</sup> Herndon, *Abraham Lincoln*, III. 507.

<sup>2</sup> Lamon, *Recollections of Abraham Lincoln*, 212; Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 25.

<sup>3</sup> ——— to Chase, March 27, 1861. *New York Tribune*, March 26, 1861.

<sup>4</sup> March 4, 1861.

<sup>5</sup> Lincoln, *Complete Works*, I. 657.

<sup>6</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 23.

listening most intently, one can scarcely hear a whisper of reform. The public offices constituted a fund, from which the most deserving party workers were to be paid for their service; positions were to be held only four years, in order that everybody might have a chance. If this were the practice when a President succeeded one of his own party, how much more when he followed an opponent! An excuse was found for such rapid change in the theory that official duties were so easy as to be within the capacity of any American. The career of Lincoln previous to 1861 did not indicate that he opposed this creed. He had held a few minor offices in his youth, before party organization and its concomitant, the spoils system, had reached Illinois.<sup>1</sup> In 1849, as the voluntarily retiring representative of his district, he had much to say about certain appointments under the new Whig administration. In one letter he stated the facts in regard to the Democratic incumbent, and requested that some general rule be adopted, and that it be applied without modification in this case.<sup>2</sup> Another letter, in regard to an officer whose removal had been requested, he premised with the statement that the man in question had done the duty of his office well, and was a gentleman in a true sense, but it is evident before the end, that he shared the desire for the removal.<sup>3</sup> Lincoln was himself an applicant, but he seems to have sacrificed his chances for the sake of a friend.<sup>4</sup>

While there is nothing in his conduct or expressed views before election which can be considered a protest against the prevailing practice, there is nothing, on the other hand, dishonorable. His language and action are always those of a man who is honest even with himself. He made no ante-nomination promises,<sup>5</sup> and as few ante-inauguration ones as possible,<sup>6</sup> but he fulfilled, in making up his cabinet, two pledges made by his managers.<sup>7</sup> One well acquainted with him would have expected an honest and politic administration of the patronage, along the customary lines, for the benefit of the party.

The pressure for a "clean sweep"<sup>8</sup> was so insistent that the administration could not settle down to more serious business until it was, in part at least, relieved. Seward, in his famous "Thoughts

<sup>1</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, I. 96, 99.

<sup>2</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, I. 153.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 155.

<sup>4</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, I. 229-231.

<sup>5</sup> Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, II. 467.

<sup>6</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 23.

<sup>7</sup> Rhodes, II. 467.

<sup>8</sup> Brooks, *Lincoln*, 207.

for the President,"<sup>1</sup> mentioned this necessity, and suggested that they "make local appointments first, leaving foreign or general ones for ulterior and occasional action." This plan seems to have been followed; for several months notices of foreign appointments are rare in the papers, and begin again during the summer.<sup>2</sup> The burden was like Sisyphus's stone, however; no sooner was one swarm of applicants disposed of, than some new act, made necessary by the war, brought another about the devoted heads of the administration. While the temptations to dishonesty, owing to the sudden expansion of the budget, caused men to drop from the civil service, and leave places to be filled, the enemy were constantly creating vacancies in the army; and the patronage was a never-ending annoyance.

The sweep made by the Republicans in 1861 was the cleanest in our history; never before did so small a proportion of officers remain to carry on the traditions of the civil service. In the 1520 presidential offices, there were 1195 changes, that may be classed under the head of removals.<sup>3</sup> In some cases there were two or three changes in the same office,<sup>4</sup> and so the number left would be a little larger than would at first appear. It must be remembered, however, that there were certainly some Republicans in office, and that there have always been civil servants whose efficiency has raised them above party, men like William Hunter, who positively cannot be spared. Moreover, many offices were in the south, and were simply left unoccupied. As more and more territory was conquered, postmasters and collectors were appointed; sometimes as "vice A. B., who joined the rebels,"<sup>5</sup> sometimes as *de novo*;<sup>6</sup> but in many cases no record whatever is found in the *Executive Journal*, from which these statistics were compiled. It is evident, therefore, that the change in personnel must have been practically complete.

In the departments at Washington, and the local offices all over the country, changes were somewhat more numerous than usual,<sup>7</sup> but here they varied from department to department, according to the disposition of those who administered the patronage in the

<sup>1</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History*, III. 445.

<sup>2</sup> It is a peculiar incident, considering the relations between Seward and Weed and Greeley, that although the "Thoughts" are dated April 1, and remained secret so many years, the *New York Tribune* of April 2 announced: "The President has determined not to consider any further changes in the diplomatic service until the more important matters which now engross the attention of the administration are decided."

<sup>3</sup> Fish, "Tables of Removals," in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1899, 82.

<sup>4</sup> *Executive Journal*, XI. 385; XIII. 316.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XIV. 495.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, XIII. 543.

<sup>7</sup> Comparison of "Blue Books" of 1859 and 1861 with those of other appropriate dates. I expect to publish, later, tables illustrating this point.

several instances. With Cameron in the War Department, we are not surprised to hear that the clerks there "received broad intimation . . . that most of them would be expected to retire, for others who had not enjoyed the flesh-pots."<sup>1</sup> The news was early given out that Chase intended seriously to enforce the law that subordinates should be examined before appointment;<sup>2</sup> and the regulation was apparently carried out.<sup>3</sup> Changes were not numerous in the State Department; William Hunter was appointed under Jackson and served until 1886, and Frederick Seward says that his father retained all the loyal clerks.<sup>4</sup>

The mention of loyal clerks suggests one reason for the completeness of the overturn in 1861. The long alliance of the Northern Democracy with the South caused office-holders to be generally suspected. In the diplomatic service the South had about its proper proportion,<sup>5</sup> yet it was popularly believed that the whole corps was pro-slavery in sentiment. The *Tribune*, June 3, 1861, stated: "In deference to universal sentiment, the President will suspend the diplomatic functions of James E. Harvey, Minister to Portugal." Seward wrote to Dayton, July 6, 1861, that our representatives in foreign courts were demoralized, and, in some cases, we had reason to believe, absolutely disloyal.<sup>6</sup> The few officials who were retained in service were those who came out decidedly for the Union, as Mr. Cisco, Assistant Treasurer at New York.<sup>7</sup> It is probably true also, as the *Tribune* stated, that the general standard of efficiency was lower than usual in 1860.<sup>8</sup> These circumstances do not explain the proscription; that was inevitable; but they partly explain its severity.

As our public men lacked the inventiveness of our mechanics, political custom decreed that all these vacated offices, and all the new ones created by the necessities of the war, should be filled by hand. Yet custom provided, also, for the subdivision of the labor. By a gradual development, beginning in the greater local knowledge of its members, and becoming particularly rapid after the election of Jackson, Congress had established a strong claim to dictate many of the appointments. Its members, indeed, seemed ready to take upon themselves the entire burden; but as the various Secretaries were responsible for the conduct of their subordinates, they claimed

<sup>1</sup> *Tribune*, March 23, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> *Tribune*, March 9, 1861.

<sup>3</sup> Hart, *Salmon P. Chase*, 216-217.

<sup>4</sup> Seward, *Seward at Washington*, I. 520.

<sup>5</sup> In 1859, 79 out of 151. "Blue Book."

<sup>6</sup> Bancroft, *The Life of William H. Seward*, II. 153.

<sup>7</sup> *Ex. Jour.*, IX. 324; X. 330; XII. 269.

<sup>8</sup> *Tribune*, March 9, 1861.



to be heard also, while the President had his own responsibility and the claims of many outside interests to consider. The irresistible conflict between these various official interests was perhaps the more keen in the early part of the Lincoln administration, because so many of the Republicans were new men, and they lacked minute knowledge of the official tradition. Lincoln's policy in adjusting these claims is to be discovered only by a study of his practice, and was probably only developed as the cases came before him. One attempt was made to relieve the administration of a part of its burden. The *Tribune* suggested, March 13, 1861, that postmasters should be chosen by vote of the Republicans in their respective districts. Lincoln advised the use of the plan in at least one instance,<sup>1</sup> and it was employed in a number of cases.<sup>2</sup> It was, however, of little practical importance.

Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, gives an account of a meeting where claims of the several interests came into conflict. It was held late in March, 1861, to arrange nominations for the state of New York satisfactory to Seward and Weed, the Senators, and the President. An agreement was finally brought about, and Lincoln proposed that it be sent at once to the Senate. Welles asked if the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney-General had been consulted, for some of the officers under consideration belonged to their departments. They had not been, but Seward said that he knew what was best for the party in the state, and that, as he and the Senators were of one mind, there need be no more discussion. Welles argued for the rights of the Secretaries; Lincoln finally decided that they ought at least to be consulted; and the nominations were deferred.<sup>3</sup>

Still, where there was harmony in the delegations, and when they met and arranged a slate, it was apt to be accepted.<sup>4</sup> In regard to the post-office at Providence, Lincoln wrote to Governor Sprague that the two Senators, the two old Representatives, and one of the new ones were combined in favor of one candidate, and added: "In these cases the executive is obliged to be greatly dependent upon the members of Congress, and while under peculiar circumstances a single member or two may be overruled, I believe as strong a combination as the present never has been."<sup>5</sup> A friend from Boston wrote to Chase, April 11, 1861: "You inquire, 'How overrule the Delegation?' I cannot and will not ask you to

<sup>1</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 340-341. Letter of March 30, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> Hollister, *Schuyler Colfax*, 173.

<sup>3</sup> Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, 71.

<sup>4</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 200, 272.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

overrule it. But in strict response to 'How?' I will say this. The Delegation have had *their* choice in Mr. Goodrich, an old Whig—never a Free-soiler. The President has had *his* choice in Mr. Tuck for naval officer, an old Whig, finally voting for Winthrop in the celebrated contest for the speakership. Though it is your department, you have not had *your* choice."<sup>1</sup> Sumner in a letter to R. H. Dana, April 14, 1861, described his interview with Lincoln, when presenting the list agreed to by the Massachusetts Congressmen,<sup>2</sup> and the *Tribune* of April 13th announced that the whole of it had been accepted, though the opposition had been strong. The President seems to have made it a uniform practice to consult with the Senators before making nominations from or for their states,<sup>3</sup> whether he could follow their advice or not. A correspondent advised Chase to send in certain nominations at once, as the next Senator from California might cause him trouble if he delayed.<sup>4</sup> While the more important state posts were thus largely controlled by the delegations, and especially the Senators, the minor offices scattered over the country were generally left almost entirely to the Representatives from the district, if they were reliable. Riddle, from the Western Reserve, had all the post-offices for the asking, except that of Cleveland,<sup>5</sup> in regard to which Senator Wade was consulted, who, however, refused to interfere in the matter.<sup>6</sup>

Although Lincoln thus made Congressional representations the basis of his system of appointments, he did not submit to dictation. There are a few evidences that Congress was not altogether satisfied, or was becoming jealous of the waxing power of the President. These are particularly interesting as indicating that the struggle between the two branches of the government might have come about, even if Johnson had not succeeded Lincoln. The first act creating the system of national banks gave the nomination of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury, and fixed his term at five years, during which he was to be removed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.<sup>7</sup> Such a change of constitutional principles was too great to be made until the question had been fully threshed out, and the act of 1864 modified the latter clause, so that merely a statement to the Senate of the cause of removal was required.<sup>8</sup> The growing distrust of the executive is

<sup>1</sup> Chase MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Adams, *Dana*, II. 257.

<sup>3</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 210, 213, 513, 578.

<sup>4</sup> ——— to Chase, March 9, 1863. Chase MSS.

<sup>5</sup> Riddle, *Recollections of War Times*, 24.

<sup>6</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 340.

<sup>7</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 3d Session, 37th Cong., App., p. 189.

<sup>8</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, 38th Cong., App., p. 169.

also shown by a provision attached to the military appropriation bill of 1863, forbidding the payment of any salary "to any person appointed during the recess of the senate, to fill a vacancy in any existing office which vacancy existed while the senate was in session and is by law required to be filled by and with the advice and consent of the senate, until such appointees shall have been confirmed by the senate."<sup>1</sup>

Not less sensitive than the members of Congress were the heads of departments, and several of them had, besides their official positions, strong political backing; such men were Seward, Chase and Cameron. To the same class belong certain powerful individuals, who, though in private life, exercised great influence at Washington; of these the most conspicuous were Horace Greeley and Thurlow Weed. The latter was the Mr. Hyde to Seward's Dr. Jekyll. Their close connection is illustrated by the following story related by Gideon Welles. Weed secured from Seward an order appointing one of his henchmen as consul at Falmouth, England. William Hunter, the veteran chief clerk of the State Department, protested to Weed, as the appointment involved the removal of an able official, whose father had received the post from Washington as a reward for some public service. Without further consultation Weed kindly destroyed the note Seward had given him, and thus reinstated the old consul.<sup>2</sup> Lincoln has best set out the political difficulties in New York state in a letter to Chase: "Ought Mr. Young to be removed? Ought Mr. Adams to be appointed? . . . Mr. Adams is magnificently recommended, but the great point in his favor is that Thurlow Weed and Horace Greeley join in recommending him. I suppose the like never happened before, and never will occur again; so, now or never, what do you say?"<sup>3</sup> The President treated Weed with consideration, but did not lack in firmness.<sup>4</sup>

Seward could not, of course, expect to control all the appointments in his department, for foreign posts have always had an especial attraction for the office seeker. Quite a number of letters were sent to Chase asking him to secure for the applicants places under the State Department, and he obtained, besides several minor positions, the consul-generalship at Rio Janeiro for an Ohioan. This office seems, in fact, to have been considered the peculiar property of Chase, for when it fell vacant he was allowed freely to name the new occupant. Still, Seward's influence was probably felt in most

<sup>1</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, 37th Cong., App., p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, 74.

<sup>3</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 44.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 425.

of the more important selections;<sup>1</sup> he was responsible for the appointment of Charles Francis Adams, against the wishes of Lincoln,<sup>2</sup> and many other estimable appointments should be credited to him, as of John Lothrop Motley, of Mr. March to Italy, and of John Bigelow as consul-general at Paris.

No one man caused the President more trouble in the distribution of the patronage than Chase, who had probably higher ideals on the subject than any one else in the Cabinet,<sup>3</sup> and was always spurred on to fight for his rights by that suspicion of all who opposed him, which is so common in people of high ideals. He strongly advocated the right of the head of a department to choose the subordinates for whom he was responsible;<sup>4</sup> but he did not attempt to control the appointments of the great collectors under him.<sup>5</sup> He was favored, however, by the President's appointing, without any pressure from him, his friend Barney to the most important post of all, the collectorship of New York;<sup>6</sup> while the immense expansion of business, and the great number of special officers needed, gave him abundant opportunity to try his hand at managing the patronage.

In 1864 Chase declared that he would despise himself if he were capable of appointing or removing a man for the sake of the presidency.<sup>7</sup> At this high standard he seems to have aimed conscientiously during his administration of the Treasury Department; but it did not always insure a wise choice of subordinates or keep him entirely out of the mud of partizan politics. Men are known by their friends. Chase disliked opposition, and on the whole did not make friends of the chief men in public life.<sup>8</sup> The impression that one gets from the letters written to him during his term of office is that, besides many high-principled men, he had about him a large number who played upon his high motives, and that he was less keen than the average man in public life in reading character. There is more flattery than is ordinary in such letters, much parade of high motive, that does not ring quite true; and, while capacity is put forward as a reason for appointment, the chief emphasis is laid upon personal friendship or need. A typical extract is the following: "Let justice be done if the heavens fall." Mr. Elliot is

<sup>1</sup> ——— to Chase, June 12, Aug. 29, Sept. 17, 1862; Jan. 5, 1863. Chase MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Adams, *Charles Francis Adams*, 145-146.

<sup>3</sup> Hart, *Chase*, 311.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 305. Bancroft, *Seward*, II. 356. Chase to Seward, Mar. 27, 1861. The appointment of his brother was involved in this case.

<sup>5</sup> ——— to Chase, April 11, 1861. Chase MSS. *Ex. Jour.*, Vol. XI., 292.

<sup>6</sup> Hart, *Chase*, 217.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 422.

capable and honest, and for *God's sake* don't desert him now for the clamor of those not his equals in either respect; a better man or one more sincerely your friend is not a candidate for the office."<sup>1</sup> Another: "I can assure you that I should look upon his appointment as *a deadly blow at your influence in this city*, and I believe Dr. Nixon is the only reliable friend of yours who is a candidate."<sup>2</sup> Another: "God knows no one needs the appointment more than I do."<sup>3</sup> One interesting recommendation is that he find a consulship for an Ohio editor, in order that an abler man might be found to fill the place.<sup>4</sup>

As a result, partly of his lack of judgment in selection and partly of the sudden expansion of the business of his department, many of his appointees got into trouble. In these cases Chase seems almost always to have been deeply moved by loyalty to friendship, and to have hesitated too long in seeing reason for removal. Perhaps, also, his legal training made him unable to appreciate that when a public servant is suspected, much less than legal proof may justify, nay emphatically call for, his dismissal. This led to continual friction with Lincoln, and much heart-burning. The most important case is that of Victor Smith, Collector at Puget Sound. He fell under suspicion of dishonesty,<sup>5</sup> probably unjust, but he was certainly guilty of sharp practice and had utterly lost the confidence of the community.<sup>6</sup> Lincoln, therefore, after a struggle with Chase, decided on his removal.<sup>7</sup> The latter in a letter to Smith expressed his unshaken confidence in him,<sup>8</sup> and assured him that he would give him another appointment if he could.<sup>9</sup>

This personal loyalty made every failure to secure his point seem a personal rebuff, and the situation became particularly strained toward the end of the administration, when Chase was leader of the radicals, and Lincoln had to conciliate all factions. In New York, Barney tried to oppose Seward and Weed,<sup>10</sup> but was not strong enough to maintain himself in the troubled sea of New York politics, and Lincoln finally decided to remove him.<sup>11</sup> Chase probably agreed with a correspondent in St. Louis, that there was "war from

<sup>1</sup> ——— to Chase, May 19, 1861. Chase MSS.

<sup>2</sup> ——— to Chase, March 9, 1861. Chase MSS.

<sup>3</sup> ——— to Chase, Sept. 3, 1861. Chase MSS.

<sup>4</sup> ——— to Chase, Sept. 1, 1863. Chase MSS.

<sup>5</sup> ——— to Chase, May 30, 1862. Chase MSS.

<sup>6</sup> Hart, *Chase*, 305-306.

<sup>7</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 364. Lincoln, *Works*, II. 335.

<sup>8</sup> Smith to Chase, June 3, 1863.

<sup>9</sup> Warden, *Account of the Private Life and Public Services of Salmon Portland Chase*, 529.

<sup>10</sup> ——— to Chase, Feb. 26, 1864; ——— to Chase, June 3, 1864. Chase MSS.

<sup>11</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 313.

the White House" upon his friends,<sup>1</sup> and matters did not become more pleasant after his withdrawal from the contest for the presidential nomination.<sup>2</sup> Finally a difficulty about an office in New York, which he fought through and finally compromised with a New York Senator, led him to send in his resignation, perhaps with the idea of forcing a definite arrangement with regard to the patronage. The resignation was unexpectedly accepted. Perhaps Lincoln did not feel like entering upon another term with the certain prospect of friction in the Cabinet. July 1, 1864, Chase ceased to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The other members of the Cabinet occasioned much less difficulty. Stanton quietly attended to his business, though he was occasionally irritable.<sup>3</sup> Cameron's remark, that if Pennsylvania had stood by him at Chicago, he would have been President, "and then we all could have gotten everything that we wanted,"<sup>4</sup> shows him a spoilsman and unashamed, but as such, he, perhaps, understood the position of the President better than Chase; while his incompetency soon caused him to be delicately transferred to a post in Russia.<sup>5</sup> The Blairs had learned politics in the school of Jackson and, like Cameron, knew the traditions, and were besides in confidential relations with Lincoln,<sup>6</sup> until the dismissal of Montgomery in 1864. The following message to the Secretary of the Interior shows that the President was disposed to consult the less powerful Secretaries: "Please ask the Commissioner of Indian affairs and of the General Land Office to come with you, and see me at once. I want the assistance of all of you in overhauling the list of appointments a little before I send them to the senate."<sup>7</sup> While he could rather peremptorily command the most powerful when necessary,<sup>8</sup> in ordinary circumstances he did not force his opinion on even the minor subordinates who dispensed the patronage. He wrote to Chase: "I have been greatly—I may say, grievously—disappointed and disobliged by Mr. Cochran's refusal to make Mr. Evans deputy naval officer, as I requested him to do. . . . A point must be strained to give Mr. Evans a situation."<sup>9</sup>

Another set of men who claimed to be heard were the governors.

<sup>1</sup> ——— to Chase, Oct. 30, 1863. Chase MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Hart, *Chase*, 310-314.

<sup>3</sup> Gorham, *Life and Public Services of Edward M. Stanton*, 246-248. Hart, *Chase* 307.

<sup>4</sup> McClure, *Lincoln and the Men of War-Times*, 132.

<sup>5</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 76-78. Weed, *Autobiography of Thurlow Weed*, 330.

<sup>6</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 374, 375, 433, 434, 438, 579.

<sup>7</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 343.

<sup>8</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 335.

<sup>9</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 42.



Governor Morton wrote: "I learn incidentally that the Indiana delegation has nominated men to be appointed brigadier-generals. I do not know who they are, and have not been consulted. I have had much more to do with the officers than any member of Congress, and have had much more responsibility in connection with the organization than any of them, and I believe I should at least have the chance of being heard before any action is taken." The President answered that the rumor was untrue, and asked him to telegraph recommendations.<sup>1</sup> No dictation, however, was allowed; when Governor Morton at another time complained of two rumored nominations, Lincoln replied that they had not been made, but added: "The latter particularly has been my friend, and I am sorry to learn that he is not yours."<sup>2</sup> To Governor Pierpont, of West Virginia, who was irritated by an appointment, the President wrote that he had thought the name of the appointee was approved by the governor, but knew that it was not the one the governor preferred.<sup>3</sup> A despatch to Governor Tod, of Ohio, was as follows: "I think your advice with that of others would be valuable in the selection of provost marshals for Ohio."<sup>4</sup>

Military appointments, in the beginning of the war, were made in the same way as those in the civil service; later the majority of promotions settled themselves. Where the administration was forced to deal with the matter the advice of the higher officers seems to have been considered, though not decisive or having a weight of authority like that of a Senator;<sup>5</sup> merely an additional factor in these special cases, valuable according to the personal influence of the individual.

While allowing that others had a right to be heard, Lincoln never forgot that he, as responsible head of the government, owed it to himself, and to the country, to be master. His Cabinet was his own, and he<sup>6</sup> maintained it, even when requested by the Republican Senate Caucus to make changes.<sup>7</sup> The freedom of choice, which he allowed the various officials, was a freedom to act within the limiting conditions of his policy. It is, therefore, important to discover, as far as possible, what that policy was.

In some few cases he sought the man whose abilities best fitted him for the post,<sup>8</sup> but these were distinctly exceptions. In general

<sup>1</sup> Foulke, *Life of Oliver P. Morton*, 154.

<sup>2</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 347.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 352.

<sup>4</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 361.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 356, 360, 362.

<sup>6</sup> Rhodes, III. 320.

<sup>7</sup> Rhodes, IV. 206.

<sup>8</sup> See for example Lamon, *Recollections*, 211.

he followed the accepted doctrine that many could perform the duties required, and that other qualities and circumstances should be taken into consideration in making the selection. As there was nothing novel in this practice, so the additional considerations were, most of them, time-honored. But in the abundance of traditions there were some that he neglected, and in this, and in the weight assigned to each, he showed his individuality.

From the days of the Continental Congress, geographical considerations have always had their influence. Had George Washington lived in Delaware, he would not have been chosen commander-in-chief in 1775. Such influences are a natural result of our territorial extent, our federal and representative government. Lincoln was himself largely indebted to them for his own nomination. His appreciation of them is sufficiently obvious from a study of his Cabinet. "Pennsylvania, any more than New York or Ohio, cannot be overlooked," he told Weed.<sup>1</sup> The geographical arrangement, once fixed, was continued through all Cabinet changes. Stanton, of Pennsylvania, succeeded Cameron, of the same state. Caleb Smith was followed by Usher, also of Indiana; Bates, of Missouri, by Speed, of Kentucky; and when Chase's place could not be filled from Ohio, an Ohio Postmaster-General was soon afterwards appointed. When McCulloch was needed in the Treasury, Usher resigned, that Indiana might not have two members. It was with reluctance, however, that, as President-elect, Lincoln yielded to advice, and requested John A. Gilmer, who was not a Republican, to take a place in his Cabinet, in order that the South might be represented.<sup>2</sup> Party consolidation seemed to outweigh geography in this instance. When he could do so without risk, however, he was glad to favor the South. The double representation of Missouri was largely due to the fact that it was the only slave state to give a respectable Republican vote. Early in 1861 he wrote to John A. Gilmer: "As to the use of patronage in the slave states, where there are few or no Republicans, I do not expect to inquire for the politics of the appointee, or whether he does or does not own slaves. I intend in that matter to accommodate the people in the several localities, if they themselves will allow me to accommodate them. In one word, I never have been, am not now, and probably never shall be in a mood of harassing the people either north or south."<sup>3</sup> When President, he gave one applicant a note for the Postmaster-General, concluding: "I think Virginia should be heard in such cases."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, I. 400.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 394.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 402.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 340.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. VIII.—5.

Another object of importance was to adjust properly the claims of the various factions that made up the party. In part this was easily accomplished. When parties are young each state is apt to have its favorite son, and geographical considerations brought the local leaders into the Cabinet. But there were still difficulties. December 24, 1860, Lincoln wrote to Hamlin: "I need a man of democratic antecedents from New England. I cannot get a fair share of that element in without."<sup>1</sup> When the Cabinet was complete, Seward, Bates and Smith, with Lincoln, offset Welles, Cameron, Chase and Blair.<sup>2</sup> This balance was not preserved throughout the term. Stanton did succeed Cameron, and Governor Tod of Ohio was asked to take Chase's position;<sup>3</sup> but the Whig element ultimately became the stronger; without counting Usher, whose earlier political relations I have been unable to learn, five members of the Cabinet at the time of Lincoln's death were of Whig antecedents. By that time, however, these old time party distinctions had become less important.

The main object of these two rules was to avoid giving offense, but not all of Lincoln's principles were negative. He was all the time using the patronage to strengthen the party and aid in carrying out the policy of the administration. Sometimes he put a prominent man in a good humor by volunteering to let him name a boy for West Point,<sup>4</sup> or by the unexpected offer of a foreign mission.<sup>5</sup> He liked the idea of appointing a man named Schimmelpfening, as it would be something "unquestionably in the interest of the Dutch."<sup>6</sup> He made, moreover, far more definite use of his power. Charles A. Dana<sup>7</sup> describes the anxiety of Lincoln lest the bill for the admission of Nevada should not pass, and a vote on the Thirteenth Amendment be lost. The prospect was that the House would oppose the bill, but by a small majority. Lincoln sent Dana to two of the New York delegation and one member from New Jersey with *carte blanche* to offer them anything in the line of patronage in return for their votes. Two were secured by internal collectorships. One held out, and was promised a \$20,000 office in the New York customs-house; he did not secure it, however, as the bargain had not been executed before the death of Lincoln, and Johnson refused to recognize it. The account of this transaction was written long afterwards, but it is circumstantial and probably

<sup>1</sup> Hamlin, *Life and Times of Hannibal Hamlin*, 374.

<sup>2</sup> Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, 34.

<sup>3</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IX. 332-343.

<sup>4</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 378.

<sup>5</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 653.

<sup>6</sup> Lamon, *Recollections*, 133.

<sup>7</sup> Dana, *Recollections of the Civil War*, 174-179.

trustworthy in the main points.<sup>1</sup> Such cases seldom come to light; and when one is found, others probably may be inferred. This simply means that Lincoln stretched a point, in time of need, in the use of the patronage, as he did in the interpretation of the constitution.

All evidence indicates that Lincoln never went to such extremes except to accomplish some really vital object, that he never abused, and apparently never used, the patronage for personal aggrandizement. After Chase's resignation, the President instructed Fessenden not to remove the friends of Chase.<sup>2</sup> Of course, the conditions made it impossible to prevent subordinate officers from interfering in factional fights, particularly those at a distance from Washington and in the south,<sup>3</sup> but Lincoln seems to have faithfully followed the principles laid down in a letter to a postmaster, accused of misusing his official power, August 5, 1864: . . . "All our friends should have absolute freedom of choice among our friends. My wish, therefore, is that you will do just as you think fit with your own suffrage in the case, and not constrain any of your subordinates to do other than he sees fit with his."<sup>4</sup> As the use of the patronage to carry out a broad national policy, if not commendable, is to be distinguished from that for personal advantage, so the latter should not be confused with a little harmless favoritism or nepotism. Lincoln was seldom nice about small points, and perhaps felt justified in getting some pleasure out of his heavy task. Many instances are given of his appointing old friends, generally for friendship's sake,<sup>5</sup> and sometimes against advice.<sup>6</sup> Mrs. Lincoln's "numerous cousins" were occasionally aided in securing favors.<sup>7</sup> He was always fond of artists, and wrote to Seward in regard to two who had painted his portrait at Springfield, that he had "some wish" that they might have some of those moderate-sized consulates which facilitate artists a little in their profession.<sup>8</sup>

Underlying all these principles, and the hundred rules implied in them, was the basal theory of the spoils system, which has been

<sup>1</sup> A hunt for the posts involved fails to reveal them, but for obvious reasons; the yeas and nays were not called for when the bill passed, the members who wanted the collectorships, doubtless, only cared for the patronage—that is, took them to give away, and the other did not get his post.

<sup>2</sup> Hart, *Chase*, 318.

<sup>3</sup> ——— to Chase, Feb. 26, 1864, states that the Republican candidate for governor of Louisiana was nominated because of his use of government patronage.

<sup>4</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 558.

<sup>5</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, I. 105, 106; II. 360, 502–505. Herndon, *Lincoln*, III. 506, 507.

<sup>6</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 430.

<sup>8</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, I. 374.

mentioned as the accepted doctrine of the day. The civil service was a great treasury to be drawn on at will. If a man drew on it for purposes high and good, provided the efficiency of the service was tolerable, he did all that could be expected of him. That the evil lay deeper than the simple use of offices for political purposes is easily seen. July 21, 1863, Lincoln wrote to Blair, that soldiers and their families had the best claim on the patronage.<sup>1</sup> This claim, widely acknowledged, has caused incalculable harm to public service, and yet seems so reasonable and proper that reformers have many times been obliged to compromise with it. It would be unjust to expect Lincoln to see the fallacy in this seductive theory, or find a solution of the problems that would arise if it were thrown aside. If he had had them pointed out to him, he would probably have replied that, for the present at least, there were things of more import than bringing administration to the highest pitch of excellence, and that he could not afford to part with this powerful party cement.

From such a creed there seems little hope of any fundamental betterment. The great civil service reform movement began just to swell in the bud during Lincoln's life-time.<sup>2</sup> One sign there was that he might have favored it; he was annoyed at the claim that the patronage made upon his time. He was loath to remove from office even a person unfriendly to him,<sup>3</sup> until the official's incapacity had been thoroughly proved;<sup>4</sup> and, inasmuch as new appointments would be entailed, he disliked to appoint any one already in office to a new vacancy.<sup>5</sup> The most notable example of this feeling, however, is found at the very close of his life. The doctrine of rotation in office had, after a long, slow growth, attained its highest point in 1856, when Buchanan, though succeeding a President of his own party, turned out the office-holders under the decent cover of this respectable phrase. When Lincoln's second inauguration approached, the expectation was that he would push the principle still further, and turn out his own appointees. He tried to stir up public sentiment against it; but on March 4, 1865, the *Tribune* an-

<sup>1</sup> Lincoln, *Works*, II. 375.

<sup>2</sup> Sumner in 1864 brought in a bill (Von Holst, *Preussischen Jahrbücher*, XXXVI. 376). Jenckes did not bring in his until the fall of 1865. A fragment of a proposed bill for consular reform did pass (*Cong. Globe*, 1st Sess. 38th Cong., App., p. 182), but was a revival of a law of 1865 (*ibid.*, 1st Sess. 38th Cong., 1115), except for the provision that consular clerks should be removed only for cause, stated in writing, at the first session following. This was passed rather, perhaps, because of jealousy of the President than desire to protect the clerk.

<sup>3</sup> Lamon, *Recollections*, 211.

<sup>4</sup> Tarbell, *Lincoln*, II. 66.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 418.

nounced: "The second inaugural of President Lincoln takes place at Washington to-day, and an immense throng of politicians . . . have already flocked thither, . . . to push their fortunes." Lincoln was firm, however, and March 7 the same paper stated: "Office-seekers were informed that no general removal of officers would be made." This really unusual willingness to diminish the power of the patronage, even though personal annoyance was the main cause of it, was a long step on the road to reform, and it is by no means improbable that Lincoln, with his wonderful capacity for growth, might have accepted the idea of appointment by examination, and advanced it to an earlier victory.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.



## THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE JOURNAL D'ADRIEN DUQUESNOY

WHO was the author of the work bearing the title *Journal d'Adrien Duquesnoy*?<sup>1</sup> The editor, M. de Crèvecœur, inferring, from what seemed to him sufficient evidence, that the writer was Duquesnoy, gave this title to the publication. M. Brette, on the contrary, declares that the evidence is insufficient to justify the inference. The question of authorship still remains unsettled. It is a question of the first importance for students of the French Revolution, for the work is one of the most valuable sources dealing with the events of the National Assembly.

The *Journal* is one of the publications of the *Société d'Histoire Contemporaine*, and was edited, as I have said, by M. de Crèvecœur. M. de la Sicotière, who was a member of the society, had in his possession a series of letters and bulletins written between June 13, 1789, and March 22, 1790. The letters, few in number, were in the handwriting of Duquesnoy, and were signed by him; the bulletins, with the exception of a few autograph corrections by Duquesnoy, were the work of copyists. This evidence, together with the fact that in his letters Duquesnoy referred to "his bulletins," seemed to justify the inference that he was the author of the bulletins found with the letters. While preparing the bulletins for the press, M. de Crèvecœur encountered in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* an anonymous manuscript in two volumes containing bulletins covering the period from May 3, 1789, to April 3, 1790. The bulletins, from June 13 on, proved to be duplicates of the bulletins in the Sicotière manuscript. M. de Crèvecœur inferred, naturally, that Duquesnoy was the author of this series also, and fused the two series in his publication and called the work the *Journal d'Adrien Duquesnoy*.<sup>2</sup>

The work was reviewed by M. Brette.<sup>3</sup> Overlooking the statement of the editor that some of the bulletins in manuscript S. bore autograph corrections by Duquesnoy, he asserted that the discovery

<sup>1</sup> Duquesnoy, Adrien, *Journal d'Adrien Duquesnoy, Député du Tiers État de Bar-le-Duc, sur l'Assemblée Constituante, 3 mai 1789-3 avril 1790, publié pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par Robert de Crèvecœur*. 2 vols., Paris, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal*, I. pp. xvii, xviii, xxxvi-xl.

<sup>3</sup> *Revue Critique*, May 11, 1896, pp. 363-373.

of the letters in the midst of the bulletins did not prove that Duquesnoy was the author of the bulletins. He also pointed out that while the publication was a correct reproduction of the manuscript B. no variants were given. He recalled the fact that M. de la Sicoitière had stated in 1885 that these bulletins and letters that he attributed to Duquesnoy began in December, 1788, and ended in May, 1790, and asked why M. de Crèveœur had not published them all.<sup>1</sup> While not believing in the authorship of Duquesnoy, M. Brette does not attempt to solve the question of authorship. He suggests that the bulletins may have been the work of anonymous writers of *nouvelles à la main*, of a M. Bernard or of a M. Fiscal, but hardly seems to take these suggestions seriously himself.

As to the hypothesis that the *Journal* belongs to the class of newspapers called *nouvelles à la main*, the evidence upon which it rests appears to me of but little value. M. Brette laid great stress upon the fact that in the manuscript B.—the only one that he has seen—the bulletins are not all in the same handwriting, and, above all, that the writing changes often at the foot of the page, even when such a change divides a sentence. Upon the first point I shall not dwell. I am acquainted with no law that enables me to decide how many copyists a man may reasonably employ at the same time—unless it be the length of his purse—nor how often he may reasonably change them. Upon the changes in the middle of a sentence or at the bottom of the page, I shall say a word. I have examined the manuscript B.<sup>2</sup> As far as I was able to discover, the sudden changes are found only in bulletins 8 and 9, and each bulletin shows two handwritings. Hardly sufficient evidence, one would think, to justify the statement that “these methods savor of the workshop of the *nouvelles*.”<sup>3</sup> The truth is that the hand-

<sup>1</sup> In the *Revue Critique* of June 22, 1896, M. Guilhaumez, who had aided M. de Crèveœur in the revision of his proofs, replied to M. Brette and gave a satisfactory answer to this question. In a note printed in the *Intermédiaire*, M. de la Sicoitière had made the statement that led M. Brette to assume that the manuscript had been tampered with. “La réalité est beaucoup plus simple : c’est la note de l’*Intermédiaire* qui est erronée. . . . M. de la S. a sans doute écrit mars, et l’imprimeur de l’*Intermédiaire* aura lu mai.” Prefixed to the manuscript S. are “quelques lettres, sans aucun rapport avec le *Journal*, et relatives à l’Assemblée des notables.”

<sup>2</sup> Bibliothèque Nationale, *Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises*, Nos. 224, 225. The manuscript fills volumes XIV. and XV. of the *Notes sur l’Histoire d’Espagne et de France*. This main head appears upon the title page with the subhead, *Correspondance sur l’Assemblée Nationale*. In the printed volumes, the matter is divided at the same point as in the manuscript.

<sup>3</sup> “Le manuscrit B. dont il nous donne le texte *in extenso* présente cette particularité que les écritures qui, pour le tome I, ne doivent pas être au nombre de plus de cinq ou six, sont alternatives et changent, non pas avec les bulletins, non pas avec les dates, mais avec les pages mêmes ; le copiste ne finit pas la phrase ; il a été payé pour écrire tant de pages, il passe la main quand sa tâche est remplie. Ces procédés sentent bien, on en conviendra, l’officine des *nouvelles*.” *Revue Critique*, May 11, 1896.

writing counts for very little in determining the authorship of these bulletins. As every student of the French Revolution knows — and no one better than M. Brette — the members of the Assembly were accustomed, especially in 1789, to send letters and bulletins to their constituents and friends in the provinces. Not only were copyists employed in the preparation of these bulletins, but after the bulletins reached the provinces they were often copied a second time that they might serve a larger number of readers.<sup>1</sup> It is quite within the bounds of possibility that there are copies of copies among the bulletins in the manuscript B. For M. Brette to lay so much stress upon the fact that the bulletins are not in the handwriting of Duquesnoy, is certainly not reasonable, although the reason for his course is clear; it is the evidence upon which M. de Crèvecoeur rests his case. M. Brette was certainly right in maintaining that the evidence was insufficient; he was wrong in believing, as he apparently does, that the case can be won only with that kind of evidence.<sup>2</sup> It is strange that he should not have seen that authorship is not necessarily dependent upon penmanship.

The theory that Bernard is the author of the Sicotière bulletins from December 9, 1789, on, because these bulletins are in his handwriting, is easily disposed of. The author of the bulletin of December 10, was a member of the Assembly.<sup>3</sup> Bernard was not a member of the Assembly and must, therefore, have copied the bulletin, as it appears in his handwriting. If he copied one, he may have copied more than one, or in other words, all that appear in his handwriting.

M. Brette's third hypothesis that a certain M. Fiscal may be the unknown author of the bulletins, is no more tenable than the other two. It evidently rests upon the misinterpretation of a sentence in one of Duquesnoy's autograph letters. Writing to the Prince, he says: "M. Bernard takes my bulletins and has them sent to you; he tells me that you have received those of M. Fiscal."<sup>4</sup> M. Brette assumes that Fiscal was a writer of bulletins. Why not a receiver of bulletins? Is it not quite possible that what Duquesnoy meant to say was, "He tells me that you received from M.

<sup>1</sup> The second volume of the *Vie et Correspondance* of Gaultier de Biauzat, published by Francisque Mège (2 vols. Paris, 1890), is a good illustration of this kind of work. See pp. 46, 51, 57, 73, 79, 80, 88, 100, 101, 109, 149, 163, 164, and especially 209.

<sup>2</sup> "Il reconnaitra aussi que des doutes sérieux subsisteront sur l'attribution globale qui a été faite tant que l'on n'aura pas prouvé par l'écriture que tous ces bulletins sont l'œuvre du seul Duquesnoy." *Revue Critique*, June 22, 1896.

<sup>3</sup> "Mon projet n'est pas de l'examiner en détail, car je suis si frappé de l'inconvénient dont je viens de parler que jamais je ne pourrai voter pour son adoption." *Journal*, II. 156.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal*, II. 150.

Fiscal the bulletins that I sent to him?" Fiscal could not have been the author of these bulletins, for the author was a member of the Assembly. In M. Brette's excellent lists of the members of the Constituent Assembly, there is no Fiscal. To M. Brette, Fiscal was an obscure person who might have been the writer of *nouvelles à la main*. Fiscal was not so obscure as M. Brette thinks. Princes, a hundred years ago, did not have letters addressed to them *par la voie* of obscure persons.<sup>1</sup> If M. Brette wishes to find M. Fiscal, he should look for him not in Paris, but in the place where the Prince of Salm-Salm was residing in November, 1789.

The remaining objections of M. Brette to the authorship of Duquesnoy rest upon other grounds than those that we have been considering. The writer makes incorrect statements. It is the opinion of M. Brette that Duquesnoy could not have been ignorant of these things. Here we are in the region of uncertainties. What is the test? Duquesnoy was from Nancy and Nancy is in Lorraine. If the writer of the bulletins should refer several times to Nancy as a city of Provence, the inference would be natural that the writer could not be Duquesnoy. Unfortunately, the facts cited by M. Brette are not of this kind and there might be a justifiable difference of opinion as to whether Duquesnoy could be ignorant of them and remain Duquesnoy.<sup>2</sup> I believe that, in face of the strong positive reasons that will be given in support of the authorship of Duquesnoy, we must infer that he was ignorant.

Up to the present time, much of the discussion upon this question of authorship has been irrelevant. A restatement of the question may render its solution less difficult. Whatever may be the relations between manuscripts S. and B., it is generally agreed that the published work is a correct reproduction of the manuscript B.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of this manuscript. It was undoubtedly written in the years 1789 and 1790. The handwriting being that of copyists, proves nothing as to authorship. Is it possible from the study of this manuscript, aided by all the resources at our disposal, to determine the authorship of these bulletins? I believe that it is. If it be not, then historical criticism is but a useless theory, for never was there a more promising opportunity for it to prove its practical value.

<sup>1</sup> "Il est étonnant que vous n'ayez pas reçu les lettres qui vous ont été adressées par la voie de M. Fiscal. M. le comte m'assure qu'elles peuvent être retardées, mais qu'elles ne seront point égarées, parce qu'il est sûr de lui." *Journal*, II. 11. Bernard to Salm-Salm.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue Critique*, June 22, 1896, p. 370.

<sup>3</sup> "La publication actuelle faite en conséquence de la découverte signalée est la reproduction scrupuleuse et correcte du manuscrit conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale dans les papiers de Beauchamps." M. Brette in the *Revue Critique*, May 11, 1896.

I shall endeavor to show (1) that the bulletins are related to one another, that is, are by the same man; (2) what the personality of the writer was, and (3) that this personality fits Duquesnoy and nobody else. I shall not examine all the bulletins. M. Brette denies that Duquesnoy was the author of the May and June bulletins of 1789. I shall endeavor to show that he was. To prove that he was the author of later bulletins, it is only necessary to show that they are connected, either directly or indirectly, with these first bulletins.

The bulletins form a series. This is made clear by such references as "the preceding number,"<sup>1</sup> "one of the preceding numbers,"<sup>2</sup> "the present number,"<sup>3</sup> "a future number,"<sup>4</sup> by references to previous bulletins by number as "Number 13,"<sup>5</sup> or "Number 44."<sup>6</sup> This last reference, found in bulletin 46, of July 11, 1789, would seem to prove that the author began to issue the bulletins at the opening of the States General.

The author also refers to his bulletins as "my journal,"<sup>7</sup> but in the same sentence refers to the "number" of the journal that he is writing. In another place he speaks of his work as "being less a gazette, a recital of facts, than a series of observations upon the facts."<sup>8</sup>

These bulletins are not intended for the general public, but for the friends of the writer in one of the provinces. He urges them to read a certain bulletin with care and "to preserve it until time and events shall have destroyed or fortified" his fears.<sup>9</sup> He frequently warns them against the false reports that circulate in the provinces, and reminds them that one who is on the spot can secure more reliable information.<sup>10</sup> He sends to them in printed form the speeches, decrees, memoirs, and other matter to which he has referred in his bulletins.<sup>11</sup>

These things, however, although they prove the existence of a connected series of bulletins, do not prove that all the bulletins in the manuscript B. primarily formed part of the series. There is a presumption in favor of it; nothing more.

<sup>1</sup> Bulletins 2, 14, 21 (35, in order, but not numbered).

<sup>2</sup> Bulletin 28.

<sup>3</sup> Bulletin 10.

<sup>4</sup> Bulletin 39.

<sup>5</sup> Bulletin 14.

<sup>6</sup> Bulletin 46.

<sup>7</sup> "Je place ici, comme je l'ai fait dans tout le cours de mon journal, un numéro destiné aux observations et dans lequel je ne garde pas l'ordre rigoureux des faits." Bulletin 34 (bis).

<sup>8</sup> Bulletin 46.

<sup>9</sup> Bulletin 10.

<sup>10</sup> Bulletins 10, 15, 21, 24.

<sup>11</sup> Bulletins 3, 6, 7, 13, 16, 19, 39.

The connection between some of the bulletins can be established by means of language. In the first bulletin—a very short one—he writes: “Je pense, et je ne suis pas le seul, que le gouvernement veut nous prendre par famine et par lassitude.” The first sentence of the next bulletin reads: “L’opinion qu’on veut prendre les députés par ennui ou par famine attache chaque instant davantage.” The appearance of the same idea in both bulletins, expressed in almost identical language, would seem to indicate common authorship. In bulletin 10 is the uncommon expression, “Une fureur de parler inconcevable!” This expression is met with again in bulletin 14, in the form, “Tous ont la fureur de parler,” and finally in an autograph letter by Duquesnoy it appears again in the phrase, “La fureur de parler que vous nous connaissez.”<sup>1</sup> Is the expression sufficiently unique to justify the inference that these two bulletins had a common author and that that author was Duquesnoy? I am somewhat familiar with the literature of the Revolution, but if I have encountered the expression in any other writer, I have forgotten it. The very unique expression, “Déliberer quatre jours sur l’aile d’une mouche,” is found in bulletins 10 and 12; it would seem to bind them to each other and to bind 12 to 14. The language employed in 2 (p. 4) and in 10 (p. 30), in describing the sermon of the bishop of Nancy, connects 2 with 10 and, consequently, with 12 and 14.

Language is, however, not the only nor is it the most important means employed in binding the bulletins together. The continuity of the narrative, the references to statements in earlier bulletins, judgments upon men and events, personal sentiments, personal interests and associations, all these things point to a common author. In dealing with these topics, we are at the same time forming a conception of the personality of the writer. Instead of grouping the matter under these different heads, I shall adopt a more practical method of presentation, treating the bulletins in their order and showing some of the possible connections.

The connection between bulletins 1 and 2 is established by the language referred to above, by a reference in number 2 to an incorrect statement in 1, and by the fact that the bulletins deal with the events of successive days and form a continuous narrative. Bulletin 3 takes up the narrative where 2 leaves it. There is, also, a reference in 3 to the “sermon de l’évêque” that would be intelligible only to a reader of 2. The remarks made in numbers 5 and 6 upon Necker’s speech, connect those bulletins with 3. The opening sentence in 4 marks that bulletin as a continuation of 3.

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, I. 85.



The two expressions quoted above connect 4 with 10; another expression connects it with 8;<sup>1</sup> a reference to Mirabeau's journal connects it with 8 and through 8 with 10; indications that the writer is from Lorraine and interested in that province connects the bulletin with 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 31, 45. The opinion expressed upon the Bretons in 4, connects the bulletin with 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18, 28. A reference to the "*règlement*" binds 4 to 5. The bulletin 5 has been connected with 3 and 4; it is connected with 6 by the use of similar expressions in both.<sup>2</sup> The bulletin 6 is connected with 4 by common expressions;<sup>3</sup> with 3 by a common opinion;<sup>4</sup> with 7 by the reference to the Duc de Praslin and by the same bond with 9 and 10. The description of Target connects 9 with 10. The bulletin 17 is bound to 16 by the references to the "projet de conciliation," and to 13 by the reference to Rabaud de Saint-Étienne and the Protestant religion. Number 19 is connected with 18 by the reference to the *garde des sceaux*, and the substance of 19 is reproduced, with many identical expressions, in Duquesnoy's autograph letter of the same date. The reference to the Duc de Mortemart binds 23 to 20, while the belief expressed in Mirabeau's venality connects 23 with 24. Bulletin 25 is connected with 24, 22, 26, and 27.<sup>5</sup> The reference to the clergy binds 29 to 27. Number 30 is connected, by the judgments expressed upon Necker, with 7, 8, 9, 10, 34, and 34 (bis). The reference to Maury, binds 32 to 31. The reference to the intrigues of the nobles, connects 33 with 34. The reference to Bouche connects 36 with 31; 37 is connected with 36 by the reference to the meeting of the *bureaux*, with 38 by the reference to the Duc d'Orléans; the reference to Bailly connects 38 with 39; the second paragraph in 40 clearly connects it with 39. These references constitute but a small part of those that might be given. They are sufficient, however, to show that it is highly probable that the first forty bulletins form a connected series and must have been the work of one man.

What was the personality of the writer? He was a member of the Third Estate,<sup>6</sup> representing Barrois;<sup>7</sup> he sent his bulletins to

<sup>1</sup> Bulletin 4, "Cet homme est une bête féroce"; bulletin 8, "De quel droit cette bête féroce, etc."

<sup>2</sup> Bulletin 5, "Le moment de l'orage approche"; bulletin 6, "Il est évident que le moment de la crise approche."

<sup>3</sup> The reference to the plan to "faire dissoudre les États, pour entraîner le ministre dans leur chute."

<sup>4</sup> The opinion upon the views of Necker.

<sup>5</sup> With 22, by the reference to Dupont and the Bretons; with 24, by the reference to the motion of Sieyès; with 26 and 27 by the reference to the Duc d'Orléans.

<sup>6</sup> The references here are too numerous for citation. Even a casual reading must make it clear that the bulletins are the work of a deputy of the Third Estate. See, however, bulletins 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 38.

<sup>7</sup> Bulletin 6, "Nous nous sommes plaints d'une démarche faite sous le nom du Barrois sans son aveu."

Lorraine ;<sup>1</sup> he was on most intimate terms with the deputies from Nancy ;<sup>2</sup> he made special mention of the words and deeds of persons known in Lorraine ;<sup>3</sup> he was a member of the *comité des subsistances*.<sup>4</sup>

There was, in the Assembly, but one man to whom this description applied ; that man was Adrien Duquesnoy. He was born at Briey in Barrois, and represented that place in the National Assembly. Some years before 1789, he had moved to Nancy, where he became a member of the *société libre des sciences, arts et belles-lettres* and also of the *Conseil de Commerce*.<sup>5</sup> In the Assembly, he was a member of the *comité des subsistances*.<sup>6</sup> Finally, he was a writer of bulletins.<sup>7</sup>

If I have succeeded in my effort to connect the bulletins, if I have correctly described the personality of the writer, and have stated exactly the facts of Duquesnoy's life, then it would seem to follow, with a high degree of probability, that Duquesnoy must have been the author of the first forty bulletins.

FRED MORROW FLING.

<sup>1</sup> See the references to Lorraine given above.

<sup>2</sup> Bulletins 4, 6, 16, 24.

<sup>3</sup> See the references to Lorraine given above.

<sup>4</sup> Bulletins 27, 39, 40.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal*, I. pp. xviii-xx.

<sup>6</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée Nationale*, I., No. 2, p. 4, the name of Duquesnoy appears in the list as representing the *généralité* of Lorraine.

<sup>7</sup> *Journal*, I. 172.

## DOCUMENTS

### 1. *English Policy Toward America in 1790-1791.*

(*Second Installment.*)

XVIII. STEPHEN COTTRELL TO W. W. GRENVILLE.<sup>1</sup>

Office of Committee  
of Privy Council for Trade  
Whitehall 17th of April 1790

*Sir*

I am directed by the Lords of His Majesty's most Honorable Privy Council, appointed for all matters relating to Trade and Foreign Plantations, to acquaint you that They have taken into consideration the Memorial of Mr. Levi Allen in behalf of the Inhabitants of Vermont, setting forth that he has been appointed under the Great Seal of the State of Vermont pursuant to an Act of the General Assembly there, to negotiate a *Commercial* and *Friendly* Intercourse between the said State and His Majesty's Dominions and proposing certain Arrangements for that purpose; which Memorial you transmitted to the Lords of the Committee in your Letter of the 10th June last; and you desire in the said Letter to receive, for His Majesty's information the opinion of Their Lordships concerning the Steps which it may be proper to take in consequence of Mr. Allen's Proposals.

The said Mr. Levi Allen has also presented a Memorial dated the 13th June last to this Committee expressing the Wishes of the Inhabitants of Vermont that a free Trade may be granted them with the Province of Quebec for all or any of the Produce of the said Country of Vermont without payment of Duty; and that they may be permitted to receive in return any of the Produce of Canada and any Merchandize imported therein, Furs and Peltry of all Kinds excepted.

Besides this Memorial the Committee have in their Office several Papers received from Lord Dorchester concerning the Policy of opening and facilitating a Passage into Canada, and from thence down the River St. Lawrence into the Atlantic for all Commodities, being the Growth or Produce of the Countries which border upon Canada and make either a part of the Territories of the United States of America, or belong to the State of Vermont, or to other People of various descriptions, who are now forming new Settlements in that part of the World.

While the Commercial Intercourse between the Province of Quebec and the Territories belonging to the United States of America, was under

<sup>1</sup> Chatham MSS. Bdle 343. Compare *Report Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. 132.

annual Regulations, established by His Majesty's Order in Council, Care was taken that no Restriction should be laid on the Trade carried on either by Land or Inland Navigation, between the said Provinces and the Territories of the United States, or other Countries bordering on the said Province; and in an Act passed in the 28th year of His Majesty's Reign for making permanent Regulations for this purpose, the same Policy of laying no Restrictions of the nature before mentioned was pursued. And the Lords of the Committee having had this Subject under their consideration of the 13th July 1787—gave it as their Opinion to Lord Sydney, then one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, that it should be left to Lord Dorchester, Governor of Quebec with the Advice of the legislative Council of that Province, to make such Orders respecting any Intercourse by Land or by Inland Navigation between the said Province and the Territories belonging to the United States of America, as should be thought by them to be most proper, not doubting that the Orders which His Lordship, with the Advice of the said Council, should give, would be consistent with the Laws of Great Britain and most conducive to the Interests of His Majesty's Subjects; but the Committee at the same time advised, that Lord Dorchester should be instructed on no account to permit, under pretence of such Intercourse, the Introduction into Canada of foreign Manufactures, or of Spirits made in any foreign Country or the Export from Canada into the neighbouring States of Furs and Peltry.

The Lords of the Committee, having received further Information on this Subject, and repeatedly taken the same into consideration are confirmed in the Opinion they before entertained that it will be advisable, in a commercial, and, they may add, in a political view also to permit, and even encourage all Articles, being the Growth and Produce of the Countries bordering upon Canada, to be brought into the said Province in exchange for British Merchandize and Manufactures, and to be Exported from thence down the River St. Lawrence, in British Ships to those parts of Europe or America where the Produce of Canada of the same sort may be legally carried. But when this Subject was before the Committee on the 13th July 1787 The Lords entertained a doubt, whether Goods, so brought into Canada from the neighbouring Countries, could be lawfully imported from thence into the British Dominions; They consulted therefore His Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor General on this Point, whose Report has not been received till lately, stating that there is no Law which makes any distinction in this respect between Goods, the Growth and Produce of those Parts of America which belong to Foreign States and those belonging to the Crown of Great Britain, provided they are brought from the Ports of a British Colony, Plantation or Territory in America, in British Ships navigated according to Law.

It is the opinion of the Committee that such Intercourse would tend very much to promote the Sale of British Manufactures, and to increase the general Commerce and Navigation of this Country and the Committee still think that no Restrictions should be imposed on this Intercourse,

except those recommended in the before mentioned Letter addressed to Lord Sydney. And in order that the Government of Great Britain may have the full possession and command of this Trade, and be enabled to subject it to such Regulations as will render it most beneficial to His Majesty's Subjects, it is much to be wished that the vessels in which these Goods are transported over the great Lakes surrounding Canada, or along the Navigable Rivers, which issue from or run into these Lakes, should be British, and belong to British Subjects only, and that the posts which command the Entrance of these Lakes, and which are best situated for securing the Navigation of these Rivers should be retained by His Majesty (if other important Considerations will so permit) and be Garrisoned by a Force sufficient to defend them ; For there can be no doubt that the various Settlements which are now forming in the interior parts of America, afford the prospect of a most Extensive and valuable Commerce to those Nations who can secure to themselves the best means of availing themselves of it.

The Committee have hitherto considered this Subject, not only as it relates to the State of Vermont but to all the Countries bordering upon Canada :—Lord Dorchester and His Majesty's Council in the province of Quebec have thought proper to consider it in this general view, and to Extend the Regulations made by them for this purpose to all the neighbouring States, tho' these Regulations evidently took their Rise from the Application made by Mr. Levi Allen, in the name of the Province of Vermont only :—And the Committee observe with pleasure, that these Regulations are conformable to the principles before stated, as will appear by the following account of them

In consequence of Powers vested in three Commissioners by the State of Vermont, Mr. Levi Allen waited on Lord Dorchester at Quebec in 1786, informing him that he was commissioned by the State of Vermont to form a Treaty of Commerce, and produced his Credentials. Lord Dorchester told him that he was not authorized to form Treaties, but that he was well disposed to live in Friendship, with all the neighbouring States, and desired Mr. Allen to State in writing the wishes of the people of Vermont, and promised that they should be duly considered. Mr. Allen accordingly presented a Memorial to His Lordship on the 22d November 1786, specifying the objects which the people of Vermont had in view in desiring to open a Commercial Intercourse with Canada. On the 18th April 1787 Lord Dorchester permitted by Proclamation (until an Ordinance could be made by the Legislative Council for more fully regulating the Inland Trade with the neighbouring States) the free Importation from all the said States, thro' Lake Champlain, of Masts, Yards, Bowsprits, Spars, Oak or Pine, Planks, Boards, Knees, Futtocks, Ship Timber, Hoops, Staves, Shingles, Clapboards, or any sort of Lumber, Pitch, Tar, Turpentine, Tallow, or any kind of Naval Stores, Hemp, Flax, and their Seeds ; Wheat ; Rye, Indian Corn, Pease, Beans, Potatoes, Rice, Oats, Barley, and all other species of Grain, Horses, Neat Cattle, Sheep, Hogs, Poultry, and all other species of Live Stock and Live pro-

visions, and whatsoever else is of the Growth of the said States. And he also authorized and permitted the free Exportation from the province of Canada into the said States, of any Articles of the Growth, Produce or Manufacture of the said province, or of any other the Dominions of Great Britain, Furs and Peltries of any Kind excepted.

And by an Ordinance of the Governor and Legislative Council, dated 30th of the same month, it was enacted, that the Trade and Intercourse between the province of Quebec, and the neighbouring States, or any of them, by the Route of Lake Champlain and Sorell, should be free for the Importation of Leaf Tobacco, Pot and pearl Ashes, if the same be of the Growth and produce of any of the said States, and that they are bona fide intended for Re-exportation from that province to Great Britain.

In the month of April in the year following Lord Dorchester and the Legislative Council of Quebec passed two other Ordinances, comprehending, in their Judgement, every thing that was at that time necessary for regulating the Inland Commercial Intercourse of that province with the Neighbouring States.

In the first of these Ordinances it is enacted That all Goods, Wares, and Merchandizes (Beavers Peltries and Furs excepted) of the Growth and Manufacture or product of that province or of any other of the Dominions of Great Britain, and such as may lawfully be imported into that province by Sea may be exported therefrom by Land or Inland Navigation to any of the neighbouring States, free from Duty Impost or Restraint: And it was also enacted that there be the like freedom of Importation from the said States into that province (if the same be made by the Route or Communication of Lake Champlain and the River Sorel or Richelieu and not otherwise) of certain enumerated articles. It then enumerates the Articles which are the same as those in the before mentioned proclamation and Ordinance, adding thereto Butter, Cheese, and Honey, Fresh Fish, Gold and Silver Coin and Bullion. The Ordinance then prohibits the Importation of Rum, Spirits, and Copper Coin and enacts several severe Regulations to prevent Contraband Trade contrary to the intention of this Ordinance.

The Second of these Ordinances, intituled "for promoting Inland Navigation," begins by a preamble reciting "that the present circumstances do not require that the Transport of Merchandize" and peltries over the Upper Lakes should be carried on solely by vessels "*belonging to His Majesty*, and that the thriving situation of the new Settlements of Loyalists in the Western Country makes it expedient under certain Restrictions to facilitate the Transport of a variety of Articles across those Lakes which will tend to increase the Exports of this province, and consequently to augment its Commerce.

It then enacts that it shall be lawful for all His Majesty's Subjects trading to the Western Country by the way of the Great Lakes who shall have taken out the usual pass conformable to Law, to cause such their Effects and Merchandize or [as?] shall be specified in the said pass, to be water borne in any Kind of vessel under the Burthen of Ninety Tons,



provided the same be built or launched in any Port or Place within His Majesty's Government ; and that all the owners of the Vessel and Cargo, and the Captain, Conductor, Crew and Navigators be His Majesty's Subjects, and that the said Crew and Navigators shall have taken (since the 1st May 1783) the Oath of Allegiance of His Majesty, prescribed by Law, or on doubt thereof, shall take the same before they embark in such adventure. The Ordinance then proceeds to require that every Vessel (except such as are under the Burthen of five Tons, navigating the River St Lawrence and the Bay of Quinty, and except all Canoes, Bateaux, or open Boats, under the Burthen of ten Tons navigating the Lakes) shall take out a Register. It requires also Bonds and several other Documents from all these vessels, forming on the whole a very accurate and strict system of Registry, and then enacts that all vessels concerned in this navigation, which shall not be furnished with a Register and the other Documents therein mentioned, and shall not produce the same to the Kings Officer in the Ports or Places where they arrive, shall be subject to Forfeiture. A power is given to the Governor or Commander in Chief of the Province for the time being, upon any great or urgent occasion to prohibit for any given time, by an Order under his Hand and Seal, even these Vessels from Navigating the said Lakes, if he may think such order necessary and for the security of the Province.

From the foregoing Account it appears to the Committee, that a Commercial Intercourse, is already opened between the Province of Quebec and the State of Vermont, as well as the other neighbouring States, upon as extensive a plan as the People of Vermont seem to have wished. It is true that this Commerce is not secured to them by Treaty. Lord Dorchester was of opinion as is before stated that he was not authorized to form a Treaty with them, and he might perhaps think that it would be offensive to the United States of America to form a Separate Treaty with a people who inhabit a Country, which the said States may consider as a part of their Territory ; a people who ought on that account to be dependent on them. It is impossible to suppose that Mr. Levi Allen can be ignorant that a Commercial Intercourse has been opened with the State of Vermont by the Government of Quebec in manner before mentioned, and as he still presses that a Treaty should be concluded it is reasonable to infer that he has some other object in view, besides the establishing a free Commerce between the Countries, and that he has probably received secret Instructions for this purpose.

To throw Light on this Point, the Committee think it right to state the Information they have lately received of the political situation of the State of Vermont.

The Country now inhabited by the People of Vermont was formerly claimed by the Legislatures of New Hampshire and New York who had frequent Disputes on this Subject. A number of Adventurers chiefly from the Territories of Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut, taking advantage of these Disputes went and fixed their Habitation in this Country, and have kept possession of it ever since. These Settlers had

at first no other appellation than that of Green Mountain Boys. But in December 1777 They assumed the Title of the State of Vermont and considering themselves as Independent, established a Form of Government; and from that time they have continued in the exercise of all the Legislative and Executive powers belonging to an Independent State— In March 1787 a Bill passed the House of Assembly of the State of New York, declaring Vermont to be a separate Independent State; but this Bill was rejected by the Senate of New York, because there was no provision made in it for securing to some of the Inhabitants of the State of New York, certain Lands claimed by them and which has [had?] formerly been granted to them, while that State made a part of the British Dominions. In a subsequent Session the Legislature of New York appointed Commissioners on the part of Vermont in order to settle the Points in dispute. The event of this Conference is not yet known; but whatever it may be, it will probably decide the opinion of the Legislature of New York concerning the Indepen[den]ce of Vermont. But there is reason to believe that the Congress lately established, will soon take this business into Consideration. Vermont has already between 70 and 80,000 Inhabitants, which is a greater number than belong to several States which now make a part of the American Confederacy. The Eastern States will be desirous from political Motives that Vermont should become a Member of the federal Government. They will wish to retain Vermont as a Frontier for their Security and there is ground to suppose that they are on that account apprehensive of its becoming connected and forming an alliance with the British Government. There is another Circumstance which inclines the Eastern States to wish that the State of Vermont should be acknowledged as Independent and made a Member of the Union.

The Settlement of Kentuck,<sup>1</sup> which consists of about as many Inhabitants as that of Vermont, and which at present makes a part of the State of Virginia, has applied both to the Legislature of Virginia and to Congress to be acknowledged as an Independent State, and to have a voice in the Federal Government. The State of Virginia who find their present Connection with Kentuck to be both Expensive and inconvenient are inclined to the proposed Separation, and many of the Members of Congress have shown a Disposition to acknowledge the Independence of the people of Kentuck and to admit them into the Union, but the Eastern States are not disposed to consent unless the State of Vermont be at the same time admitted as they apprehend that the influence of the Southern States in Congress will become too powerful by the accession of Kentuck unless it is counterbalanced by the addition of a new Member connected in Interest with the Eastern States. From Information received it is probable that this point was brought into Discussion during the Second Session of Congress which commenced in January last.

<sup>1</sup> The spelling is doubtful, perhaps it should read Kentucte here and following.

The foregoing facts sufficiently explain the Impatience shewn at present by the Agent of Vermont to be informed of the Intention of the British Government with respect to an Alliance with the State of Vermont.

It belongs not to the Committee to decide how far any Article in the late Treaty of Peace, by which the Independence of the United States was acknowledged and the Extent of their Territories defined, may make it improper for the Government of this Country to form a separate Treaty with the State of Vermont, or whether it may be politically prudent all circumstances considered, to risk giving offence to the Congress of the United States by such a Measure ; but the Lords are of opinion that in a commercial view it will be for the Benefit of this Country to prevent Vermont and Kentuck and all the other Settlements now forming in the Interior parts of the great Continent of North America, from becoming dependent on the Government of the United States, or on that of any other Foreign Country, and to preserve them on the contrary in a State of Independence, and to induce them to form Treaties of Commerce and Friendship with Great Britain.

Besides the State of Vermont and the Settlement of Kentuck, six other Settlements are said to be already forming in the interior parts of the American Continent, some of them by encouragement from the United States ; others under the Protection of the Spanish Government ; and some appear to have no connection hitherto with any Foreign Power. There can be no doubt, that the Numbers of People in these Settlements will very rapidly increase partly by the ordinary course of Population, and partly by Emigrants from the United States, and by others who may resort to them from the Nations of Europe. As People of this description must for a Number of years be principally employed in raising Provisions, and such other Articles as are best adapted to the Nature of the Soil, which they possess, and to the Climate, under which they live, it is evident that during that period at least, they will be under the necessity of importing from Foreign Countries such Manufactures and other Commodities as contribute most to the comfort and enjoyment of Life and whatever Nation is best able to supply them with these Merchandizes at a reasonable rate, cannot fail to derive great commercial Advantages from their Intercourse with them.

The Countries where all the before mentioned Settlers (except those of Vermont) have fixed their residence are separated from the Countries inhabited by the People of the United States, and from the Atlantic Ocean by a large Ridge of Mountains which must be passed, if they attempt to open by that Way any commercial Intercourse. The Expence of Land-Carriage over these Mountains will so enhance the Price of any Commodities, which they may wish to purchase, as to make it very expensive and difficult for them to obtain Supplies by that mode of Conveyance ; and it will still be less practicable to convey the Produce of the Soil in which these Settlers must make their Returns, being all bulky Articles, over these Mountains to the Heads of the Rivers, that run from the

foot of them into the Atlantic. It is clear that even the People of Vermont, who are more conveniently situated for a Commercial Intercourse with the United States, find that such Intercourse by Land-Carriage is by no means so practicable, or likely to be so profitable to them, as a direct Trade with Canada, carried on by means of Lake Champlain, and from thence into the River St Lawrence. It is certain therefore that the various Settlements that are now forming in the interior Parts of the American Continent, will wish to open a Communication with Foreign Nations, either by passing the great Lakes and from thence into the River St Lawrence, or by descending through the various Rivers, that run into the Mississippi, and by following the Course of that River into the Ocean. There appears to be no other practicable Channels by which these Settlers can carry on the sort of Commerce in which they will necessarily be engaged, and there are Circumstances which make it probable, that the Passage over the great Lakes and by the River St Lawrence will be found of the Two to be much the most convenient. It will be fortunate for Great Britain if this Channel continues exclusively under her Command; for the Commerce, so carried on, will be attended with this singular advantage that the Ships employed in it must belong wholly to the subjects of the British Empire. It appears from Information lately received that the People of Kentuck are desirous of forcing their way down the River Mississippi to the Ocean. They have already applied to the Congress of the United States for obtaining through their Influence with the Court of Spain, a free Navigation on that River. They found their claim to it upon the Right naturally resulting from the possession of the Countries bordering on the Rivers flowing into the Mississippi; and they alledge that by the Treaty of Peace of 1763, between England France and Spain, the free Navigation of the River Mississippi was secured to England and was exercised till the Peace of 1783, and that, by the Treaty then made with America, England ceded to the United States the free Navigation of that River.

The Spaniards are very jealous of any Communication which the Americans may wish to have, by means of the River Mississippi, either with the Indians, or any other Persons settled in the interior Countries of America. To prevent such Communication they now employ British Agents, Subjects of His Majesty and attached to the British Interests to manage the Indians in the Southern Parts of this Continent and to supply them with British Manufactures which are sent out annually from Great Britain by Vessels under the protection of Passes given by the Spanish Ambassador residing in London; And these Manufactures are paid for by great Quantities of Deer Skins and some other Peltry, permitted to be exported from Spanish Ports in British Ships directly to Great Britain. There is every reason also to believe, that a very lucrative Commerce is now carried on from the Port of Providence in the Bahamas and from the Free Ports in the Island of Jamaica to the Spanish Ports in the two Floridas which is at least connived at by the Spanish Government in order to prevent the People of the United States from

obtaining any Influence over the Indians and having any share in this Trade.<sup>1</sup>

It cannot be doubted that the Navigation of the River Mississippi will soon give rise to many contests between the Government of Spain and the American Congress, who will wish to support the Settlers in the interior Parts of America in the claims they may urge on this account, with a view to secure to themselves the Friendship of these new Settlements, and thereby to open to the Vessels of the United States the Entrance of the River Mississippi.

What may be the Issue of these Contests it is not possible at present with any degree of certainty to foretell, nor is it prudent yet to pronounce what ought to be the Conduct of Great Britain in this respect ; It is proper however for the Committee to observe, that there will be less danger in encouraging the Navigation of Spain in those Seas than that of the United States and that the Ships of these States are more to be apprehended, as Commercial Rivals than those belonging to the Subjects of the Spanish Monarchy.

The Committee have thought it right, that I should enter into this detail in delivering Their Opinion on the Question you referred to Them by His Majesty's Command concerning a Commercial Intercourse with the State of Vermont. It appears to them that the same Policy, which ought to direct the Conduct of Government with respect to Vermont applies equally in a Commercial Light to all the other Settlements, that are forming in the interior parts of the American Continent and that no true Judgement can be formed of the measures which ought on this occasion to be pursued without taking comprehensive view of this Subject in all its Parts, especially at a time when there is reason to suppose that a Commercial Treaty may soon be negotiated with the Congress of the United States of America, at a time also, when the Committee observe, with the highest satisfaction, that the Manufactures of this country are improving and progressively increasing in so great a degree, that it is necessary to seek for new Markets in every Part of the World, in order to afford sufficient Scope and further Encouragement to the Industry of His Majesty's Subjects.

I have the Honor to be, With great respect

Sir

Your most obedient

And most humble Servant

STEPH. COTTRELL

## 2. *Two Letters of Richard Cromwell, 1659.*

In the Lansdowne collection of manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. 821, are twenty-three letters of Richard Cromwell to his brother Henry. Most of them are of little value, but two, fols. 153 and 154, possess importance as proving that Richard did not so

<sup>1</sup> See the documents relating to Bowles.

readily acquiesce in his downfall as is generally supposed. Heath states that he declared himself unwilling to "have a drop of blood shed for the preservation" of his greatness, which was "a burden" to him (*Chronicle*, 744). While it is not improbable that he made these assertions, it is plain from these letters that he soon changed his mind, as indeed, was commonly believed at the time. Barwick writing Hyde on May 2d remarks that "they say he much repents of what is past." (*Thurloe*, VII. 666.) It is equally plain that Guizot was mistaken in asserting that "Richard allowed more than a month to pass before he wrote to his brother or sent him any directions." (*Guizot*, I. 143.)

The letters here printed are written in cipher (deciphered) and are neither dated nor signed. The events mentioned, however, assign the first letter almost certainly to the 12th of May, and the second to the 17th of the same month. They are misplaced as they stand in the collection. It is possible that they were not received by Henry Cromwell, for he complains in a letter written to his brother on the 23d that he has heard nothing from him "for some time before the last parliament was dissolved." (*Thurloe*, VII. 674.)

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

I. (FOLIO 154).

I shall not say in how sad a condition I and owre famuly, nay the nations are in for it is better for me to throwe myselfe in the dust and crye before the Lord, my sins hath brought what is come to pase upon us but truly it is as low as men can make it and the flourishing bough of it at spring is weathered I shall let my deportement be made knowne by my Bro<sup>1</sup> and Petty<sup>2</sup> the first beinge a spectator to my carriadge at the time the par sat I can assure you I stooode not so highe as my father did yet I thought it was fitting I should keep the ground of a good conscience wch I have done hetherto though it be for my present ruen and famuly for I could not have beleved that religion relation and selfe interest wold have deceived me sense Petty departure whoe was fully instructed the same for Scotland at the same time being sent for youre better correspondency the rumpe of the parl hath met<sup>3</sup> whoe are about sixty and are very violent upon him that is gone as wel flyinge high upon those that are living there is a commitee of safety apointed who sits at Wallingford Howse the names of them are Fl<sup>4</sup> Des<sup>5</sup> Vane Hasselrige Ludlow Lambert and others<sup>6</sup> they are propounding to the parl five generals that

<sup>1</sup> Lord Broghill. He left London April 29, 1659. *Thurloe*, VII. 665.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Petty, afterwards the celebrated Sir William Petty.

<sup>3</sup> May 7.

<sup>4</sup> Fleetwood.

<sup>5</sup> Desborough.

<sup>6</sup> Appointed May 7 (*C. J.*, VIII. 646) but did not include Lambert and Desborough until the 9th. (*Ibid.*)



shal have equal powers whoe are not to act a part in the government of the army<sup>1</sup> though youre provocation is very greate and you have a great sense of the honor of my deceased father and the perishing condition of the famuly yet youe wil be wary what you doe for youre owne sake and the sake of those that shal have an affection with you nothing giveth hopes but a cleare understanding and good correspondency with general Moncke whoe hath written a letter which is very favorable<sup>2</sup> but I hope it is only to hold himselfe in a good opinion with them at Westminster until a faire oportunity I beleive they here intende to be very vygorous and briske if not timely prevented which cannot be but by a diversion from the forces at the distant places I knowe noe hope but some such way and that must be also assisted by frinds and strong places here<sup>3</sup> which if there be and hopes with you there being none left here it wil be necessary that we should keepe boeth often and close correspondency I am now in daly expectation what course they wil take withe me my confidence is in god and to him wil I put my cause I have heard nothing from Scotland or Dunklerque nor fleete this nation is ful of raige and unquietnes 500 horse would have turned al but my E<sup>4</sup> was a spectator how corporals led troops from there captaines and captaines from there colonels I beleive K and L<sup>5</sup> are not longe lived if it wold please god to let them see there dainger yet theings might be retreived but oure hopes are lowe I knowe not whether a liberty or a prisson The Lord be with you and for me pray doe nothing that may be for your ruen but lay youre bussines withe united strength and then leave the succese to god I could wish you could have a correspondency by some ship from Ireland to general Mountague

I rest

deare brother

youres most affectionatly

## II. (FOLIO 153).

I am not able to advise my freinds my counsell and my relations having all forsaken me<sup>6</sup> I am now attending the greate god, whoe is only

<sup>1</sup> This suggestion was made to Parliament on May 11 (*C. J.*, VII. 649). On the 13th, however, seven instead of five were named (*ibid.*, 650), a fact which shows that Richard wrote after the 11th and not later than the 13th. As he does not mention the discussion in Parliament over the naming of a committee of state, which took place on the 12th, it seems certain that the letter was written on that day.

<sup>2</sup> *I. e.*, to the Rump. Read in Parliament May 9 (*C. J.*, VII. 647). No date is given when written, but it must have been before the 5th. (Guizot's *R. Cromwell*, I. 381.)

<sup>3</sup> As Richard does not mention the offers of assistance repeatedly made by Bordeaux to Thurloe on behalf of France even as late as May 18 (Guizot, I. 379-385, 387, 389) it seems probable that these had not been communicated to him by Thurloe.

<sup>4</sup> Broghill. The word "lord" preceding has been erased.

<sup>5</sup> Fleetwood and Desborough. K and L being their cipher designations.

<sup>6</sup> The formal adhesion of Monk and his officers was read in Parliament on the 18th (*C. J.*, VII. 658). It was dated the 12th. Lockhart's submission to Parliament was made on the 17th (Thurloe, VII. 670-671) and was also read in Parliament on the 18th (*C. J.*, VII. 657).

my hope I wish he had been more when in prosperity but as to the ey of men I was not wanton they have nothing to say though I am in the duste with my mouthe as to god I shall not direct you to your owne counceles being only able to offer you matter of fact wch would be too tedious and supitious to relate it in paper and therefore I have as farre as I can instructed doctor King whoe hath seen things and understood more by his generall converse than myselfe Pray have a care whoe you trust the world is false And for myselfe those that were my father's freinds *pretended ones* only were myne it required time to acquaint myselfe with them and they tripped up my heeles before I knew them for though they were relations yet they forsooke me I knowe Ffld and Desb regaurds not ruen soe that they may have there ends they are pittiful creatures god will avenge innocency I have acquainted this bearer with Mounkes letter<sup>1</sup> in answer to what I sent him wch was the same I sent to you it is a poore one ; and without Bro can retrive and the flecte stand stenche there is noe hopes as to my busines greate severities are put upon mé and I exspect the greatest this afternoone I looke for comittee to come unto me, with yesterdays votes<sup>2</sup> this bearer shal alsoe be acquainted wth them thes men intend nothing lese then ruen to us boeth yet let me not provocke youre judgement I knowe not more to say, but to let you know the great men doe not agre and that the army is in greate disorder the horse and foote the one for his penny a day the other for his thrippence a day besides honest men throwne out only because they were protectorians David's case was very heard let us rely upon the god of our ffather. and it wil be as much o' hon' to know how to. I shall desire the Lord to be y<sup>or</sup> helpe in all y<sup>or</sup> streight, and difficultyes with myne, and my wyfes true respects I rest

I would faine knowe what Bro sayes in this oure case pray have a familiar kindnes to him.

3. *A Letter of Marquis de La Fayette, 1781.*

THE following letter has been kindly sent by Dr. Frederick Tuckerman of Amherst, Massachusetts. The original is in the possession of Mr. Marvin M. Taylor of Worcester, Massachusetts, whose wife was a lineal descendant of Dr. Samuel Cooper, to whom the letter was written. A short sketch of the life of Dr. Cooper will be found in Vol. VI. of the REVIEW, pp. 301-303.

CAMP NEW YORK Virginia 26th October, 1781.

*My Dear Friend*

The Glorious, and important success, we have obtained will afford joy to every true American, and I heartily congratulate you upon an event, that has such an immense influence in our Affairs—Nothing but the great distance I was from you has prevented my writing more fre-

<sup>1</sup> See the previous letter, where Richard declares that he has not yet heard from Monk.

<sup>2</sup> Committee appointed May 16th (*C. J.*, VII. 655). Pickering and St. John reported May 25, presenting Richard's abdication, which had been signed some time earlier (*Ibid.*, 654). The votes referred to were probably those of the 16th.

quently than I have done—but there was such a danger of letters being lost or intercepted, that it spoiled in great measure the pleasure of a friendly correspondence. The storm that had been gathered against this small Army gave us great deal of trouble to maintain the Vessel afloat. Nothing but the bravery, fortitude zeal and discipline of our regular force, the patriotism, and patience of our militia, could have saved us from ruin, and extricated us from our innumerable difficulties—at last, it became possible to recover the ground we had lost and from post, to post, the enemy took the very one which could the best suit our purposes.

The combination of Means, which from so different and so distant points were timely collected in this Bay have insured us a success so brilliant in itself so great in its consequences that it must add a new glory to Genl Washingtons name and become a new tie of confidence and affection between the two Nations.

Virginia had been the place pointed out by the British Ministry. Virginia was the object of this Campaign, and the thunders of Britain were in the hands of a Man whose great and well supported character, ranks him among the Heroes of England, and places him far above any General they have hitherto sent to America. What will be the feelings of that proud Nation when they hear that their best General, their best Officers, the remainder of 18 of their best Corps amounting to 7050 men exclusive of Seamen, and a great number of vessels have surrendered to an Army equal to that which made the boasted Siege of Charlestown where less than two thousand men, after forty five days of oppressed marches were with difficulty persuaded to accept of conditions which after eleven days have been imposed upon Lord Cornwallis's Army. It is true there has been less gallantry on the part of the British, and less sense on the part of their General displayed in the Siege of Charlestown than in any Siege that ever was made—But however our garrison of Charlestown was paid a very great Compliment to when after so short a space Lord Cornwallis accepted the same terms I am far from reflecting on that General whose talents I greatly admire and whose lessons I have been proud to take in the course of this campaign, but cannot help observing that Sir Henry Clinton's repeated blunders have thrown the Gallant Cornwallis in this disagreeable situation, and that no Man has ever helped me so well to deceive Lord Cornwallis dangerous positions—as the Commander in Chief of the British Army.

The operations of the Seige will be so fully related to you that it is needless for me to enter into details I shall only observe to my friend that never my feelings have been so delightfully gratified as they were on the 14th in the evening, when the American light infantry in sight of the Armies of France America and England gallantry stormed a redoubt Sword in hand, and proved themselves equal in this business to the Grenadiers of the best troops in Europe. I long ago knew what dependance was to be put on them, and was so sure of success, that not a gun had been loaded—but to see this little affair transacted under the eyes of Foreign Armies, gave me Unspeakable Satisfaction.

My present wish (*entre Nous*) is to go round with the fleet to the Southward—how far I will be able to effect this purpose is not yet determined, at all events I will be in Philadelphia in the course of the Winter—and should the Armies remain quiet should Congress think I may serve them in Europe, I shall be happy to cross, and recross the Atlantic in the space of a few months provided I see my going there may be materialy serviceable—that is, my dear Sir, the present plan I have in view, and whatever may be the wishes of Congress, nothing on my part will be neglected to render them my services. At all events I shall endeavor to pay a visit to my Friends in Boston—the attachment, and partiality I feel for that Capital can not be sufficiently expressed—I set such a value by the esteem of your Countrymen that it will ever animate me under every difficulty I may encounter, their reception on my return from France, and the many favors I have received from the people at large, and from individuals in particular, shall ever be precious to my heart.

Mr. Cooper is returning to Boston, and hopes to be exchanged. I am very desirous to see every particular respecting Halifax Newfoundland and Penobscot—I request you will take some pains on this head—and send the accounts to me at Philadelphia under cover of the Massachusetts Delegates. It is very well worth sending an express on purpose and I would wish to know what Expedition you think might (for next campaign) become most agreeable to your State—

Present my best compliments to the Govenor and his Lady, Mr. Baudouin Mr. Cushing and all our friends—remember me most affectionately to your family and believe me

Yours for ever

LAFAYETTE.

*4. A Letter of Alexander H. Stephens, 1854.*

THE original of the following letter is the property of Miss Martha Reid Robinson of Chicago. It was written to her grandfather, Colonel Robert Sims Burch, who studied law with Mr. Stephens, and was afterwards for some time in partnership with him in Crawfordville, Georgia. At the time when the letter was written, Colonel Burch lived in Marietta, Georgia.

J. F. J.

WASHINGTON D C

15th June 1854

*Dear Bob*

Your letter of the 12<sup>th</sup> Inst was received this morning. I was at home last week, and last Sunday was a week I spent at Atlanta. I thought of you often on that day and if I had been right sure of your being at home I should have spent the day with you instead of spending it where I did. But I feared I might have my ride up to Marietta only to meet with a disappointment and as it was I made out luckily to pass the day most

agreeably with our old friend Floyd Mims.<sup>1</sup> Much of the time was taken up in talking over scenes which now exist only in memory. I *intend* however to see you this summer some time. I am now in good health—that is good for me. I am hardly ever in such condition or state of feeling as would warrant me in saying that I am well. With me in this particular I always have to speak in a comparative sense. I am therefore and with this explanation gratified at being able to say that I am a good deal stronger and feeling a good deal better than when I saw you last.

As to that part of your letter which bears upon the political prospects of the country etc I can only say that every thing here now on such questions is completely at sea. There are really no parties in this country. There are persons calling themselves Whigs and others calling themselves Democrats but these terms do not designate in the slightest degree classes of men agreeing upon any of the public questions or issues of this day. What is to turn up in the future I can not tell. My opinion is that Parties must form upon questions and it is idle and futile to attempt to keep up these old unmeaning designations which had their day with the questions that brought them into being. I don't think it proper at this time to take any lead towards the formation of new parties—"sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." I would support Dickinson upon present questions and as he now stands before the country with a great deal of pleasure. But whether he will be a candidate or how he may stand upon the questions before the country two years hence I have no idea. In reference to *myself* however I must say that no inducement on earth could prevail on me to allow my name to be connected with either of the offices—that of President or Vice President. I have no ambition that way. I want no office in the world. I hold my present place rather against than in accordance with my wishes. Nothing but a sense of duty or the belief that I might do the country some service induced me to run the last time. This may seem strange to you and I would not so write to hardly any other man because I know that human nature is such that I should not be credited in the declaration. But I believe you know me well enough to do me the justice to give me credit for sincerity in making the statement.

My sole object here now is to serve the country. I have little or no confidence in Parties as such of any name or style. And I think the less a public man is trammelled by them the more efficient he is to do good. Since the triumph of the Nebraska Bill I feel as if the *Mission* of my life was performed. The retrospect for the last ten years since I have been on this *theatre* to me is most gratifying. When I think of the state of the country then and now—the nature of the principles and issue between the two great sections of the Union growing out of the institution of Slavery and upon which the peace harmony and even existence of the Union depended and my own connection with the settlement of those principles upon several most critical occasions in that period—the review

<sup>1</sup> John Floyd Mims, agent of the Georgia Railroad at Atlanta, and mayor of that city in 1853.

is as pleasing and as joyous as it is for the Storm tossed mariner to gaze in delight upon the bow of promise arching in its gorgeous brilliancy the blackened elements of the tempest cloud as it passes over with its fury spent leaving him with rudder safe, masts erect and sails untattered and untorn to bear him still onward to his destined Haven. This contemplation is the more particularly gratifying to me for some reasons you will allow me to mention. In the first place duty as I understood it required me on several occasions to assume positions not only against the prevailing opinions in our section of the country upon the issues presented while this contest or slavery controversy was raging but against the judgment of some of my best friends. This was very painful to me. But I looked alone to the future for my vindication. I knew I was then misunderstood but I felt an inward assurance that *time* would bring all things right. That future to which I looked has come. That time which I trusted has done its work. And when the signal guns upon Capitol Hill proclaimed the final passing of the Nebraska Bill I felt that the cup of my ambition was full. And to be a little more specific in the reasons to which I have alluded I will state what you may well recollect.

Ten years ago, the first Session of Congress after I took my seat the Texas question was started. The subject was brought forward by Mr. Tyler under the guidance of Mr. Calhoun secretary of state in the form of a treaty with Texas. That treaty stipulated for the *cession of Texas* as a *territory* of the United States to be held as the other *territories* of the General Government and without any *guaranty* or *security* against the exclusion of Slavery therein by Congress. It also provided for the payment of the debts of Texas to which I was opposed. But the main point with me was the absence of any *provision settling the Slavery question* to which the measure gave rise. On this ground I opposed it. It was with me a controlling point. Because at the North *Annexation* was zealously espoused by those who openly declared their intention of making it *free* territory or in other words of excluding the Southern people from carrying their slaves there, this *ground* of opposition on my part was asserted throughout the state to be nothing but a *pretext*. I was charged with being opposed to the acquisition. And it was in vain that every where I declared myself in favour of the acquisition upon such terms as would give the South security. It was again and again asserted that I was demanding what I knew could never be obtained. I insisted that we should accept no terms of annexation that did not *secure* in the bonds of union the right of all states that might be formed out of the territory South of 36.30 the line established in 1820 to come into the Union with Slavery if they saw fit. This it was said was equivalent to open *hostility* to annexation and I was accordingly charged with being an enemy to Texas annexation. This to me was *painful*. For there was not a man perhaps in Georgia more in favour of annexation upon safe terms than myself. This was the first great sectional struggle after I came to Congress. I *maintained* my position. I withstood the assaults upon my motives and patriotism. And to my gratification then I succeeded with



six other Southern men who acted with me in defeating any scheme of annexation which did not contain the guaranty that I demanded. And when the friends of annexation North and South found that they could carry no other measure they were compelled to take the plan advocated by me. And the Resolutions drawn up by Milton Brown of *Tennessee* after consultation and advisement with me *exactly* on the basis I had maintained throughout Georgia in the canvass of 1844 were finally passed and became the bond of Union between the two Republics. There were no afterclaps. The slavery question involved was settled and put to rest in the very terms of the Union between the two countries. This I say was the first contest between the North and the South after I came to Congress. The next grew out of our Mexican acquisitions. That was much the fiercest and became much the most dangerous because this question was not settled at the time of the acquisition as it ought to have been. The part I took in that contest was also much the most dangerous and perilous to me personally. The danger and peril I met. The whole South, nearly, again under the lead of Mr. Calhoun, had agreed, after the strife had become threatening, to what was called the Clayton Compromise. This was a Bill introduced in the Senate in 1848 providing for the establishment of territorial Governments for the country acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Peace of that year and Oregon.

The North had for several years claimed the right and power to exclude Slavery from all these common territories. This Legislative exclusion under the lead of Mr. *Wilmot* had passed the House every time it had been offered. The right thus to exclude by Congress was almost universally denied by the South. But besides this difference there was still another point of disagreement. I *believed and knew* that upon the acquisition all the laws of the Country ceded which were not *inconsistent* with the Constitution of the United States would continue in force until changed or modified by the lawmaking power of the new sovereign to whom it was transferred. I knew also that Slavery had been abolished by law throughout the Mexican territories before the cession. We got the country therefore with a positive exclusion of Slavery by law at the time of acquisition. This exclusion I insisted should be taken off or provided against by Congress so that the South might have some participation in this vast region of public domain. But in this position I stood almost alone in the entire South. And at this stage of the controversy Mr. Claytons Compromise was agreed upon in the Senate. It abstained from a positive exclusion of Slavery by Congress. In other words it *omitted* the Wilmot Proviso upon which the North had insisted with such pertinacity and *referred* the question as to whether the Mexican *antislavery law* had been rendered null and void by the operation of the Constitution of the United States alone or not to the Supreme Court of the United States. Their decision was to be final. If they should decide that the Constitution by *itself* without any *legislative act* did not change, repeal, or modify an existing local law of that nature and character then the South was to be *forever* excluded from the territory thus

acquired. And the Bill further provided that neither Congress or the people of the territories should ever pass any law either establishing or prohibiting slavery therein. The *status* of the country was to remain *forever* as it was at the time of the acquisition upon the subject of slavery except in so far as the Constitution by itself without any exercise of the legislative power under it had changed or altered it. This was the Clayton Compromise. The whole South nearly hailed it as a *triumph*. I looked upon it as worse than the "*Wilmot Proviso*." For if the Wilmot Proviso was *unconstitutional* as was held generally by the advocates of this Bill the Supreme Court would so hold anyhow. So no harm could come of that if our rights were in any event to be left to them in the last resort. But in case the Supreme Court decided as I had no doubt they would that the Constitution by itself neither established or abolished slavery anywhere that it simply protected and guaranteed its enjoyment in all parts of the Union, territories as well as States where it was not *prohibited* by the law of the place—I say in case the Supreme Court so held then by the terms of this Clayton Compromise the power or right to change the *status* of the Country or the law of the place in this particular was denied by an express clause both to Congress and the people of the territories. It was this Bill you know I was so bitterly denounced for defeating. On my motion it was laid on the table in the House after it was passed by the Senate. I was called a *traitor* an Arnold etc. I was asked if I had any hopes of ever getting a better Compromise even by friends who did not like it very well themselves. I stood this and a great deal more but not without the shedding of some blood. I stood it all nevertheless however looking to that future of which I have just spoken. Time rolled on—

"Men change with fortune, manners change with climes,  
Tenets with books and *principles with times*."

My *justification* came sooner than I expected. For in little over two years I lived to hear men demanding a repeal of the Mexican anti-slavery law, which they had denounced me as a traitor for saying existed! But this is not all. The question was again up in Congress. The strife raged hotter and fiercer than ever. I was willing to divide the country on the line of 36.30, the same which was fixed on the acquisition of Texas, with a recognition of our rights south of that line. This the North would not grant and a majority of the South also opposed upon *constitutional grounds*. I need go no further into detail. Suffice it to say that if the South had then stood by me we should have got a clear and unequivocal repeal of the Anti Slavery law existing in the territories at the time of the acquisition. But as it was we got the guaranty that the people when they come to form state Constitutions should come into the Union either with or without slavery as they may determine for themselves. This guaranty was not confined or limited to territories South of 36.30 but up to the 42d North latitude. We got the right secured to the people of the territories of Utah and New Mexico to change the anti

slavery law of those territories if they saw fit to do so, and under which right secured the people of Utah have recognized slavery in their system. New Mexico I have little doubt will also do the same. But the great principle established in 1850 was that there should be no Congressional restriction or exclusion of Slavery in the territories of the Union, and that new states shall come into the Union either with or without Slavery as the people in forming their state constitutions shall determine for themselves. This was the principle established in 1850. The *restriction* in 1820 was inconsistent with that and hence when we came this year to organize Govmts for Kansas and Nebraska we demanded—I demanded—that this principle should be recognized and carried out and the restriction of 1820 declared null and void. It has been done. Are we not in a much better condition today than we were in 1843 when I took my seat on the floor of the House—I mean the South? Are we not in an *infinitely* better condition than we would have been in if the Clayton Compromise had been adopted? May I not look back and proudly demand of my bitterest assailants whether time has not shown that I was right and they were wrong? Could or ought ambition to ask or desire more? But I have done. You must excuse this long scroll. When I commenced it I had no idea of filling one sheet. I have just run on as I might *talk* to you if I were with you and to nobody else. You know there are certain things with [which] everybody treasures up in the heart which are communicated to but few. So it is with me today towards you. I would not so express myself as I have to you to hardly any other person for various reasons. In the first place it might be thought that I treasured ill will towards those who thought differently from me in days gone by upon issues now past, when in fact I have no such feelings. Nor have I any wish to exult in a triumph which would awaken unpleasant reminiscences. Conscious all the time of being in pursuit of the right and nothing but the right I am amply rewarded by seeing the right triumphant in the end. I barely intended to say to you that I have no desire to build up *parties* as such. All combinations of men have a tendency in themselves to grow corrupt. And the best position for every honest man in public position especially is to have as few party obligations to fulfil as possible. I trust for the *honor* to say nothing of the safety of the South that there never will be another affiliation on the part of any portion of her people with the Northern Whig Party constituted as it now is. And I trust also that no portion of the Southern people will ever again go into any National Convention to nominate candidates for President and Vice President with any Party which does not first *purge* itself of all *freesoil* elements. This is what I wanted done in 1852. The country is in better condition for this plan or *reorganization* than it has ever been before. Mr. Pierce is a good, social, clever gentleman, *individually* sound and right upon all these questions. But he will not make them a *test*. The consequence will be that he will fall. His administration is now powerless. His cabinet is divided. He was for Nebraska, but those democrats at the North who have received the

largest amount of patronage for their friends went against it. Marcy I have no doubt was hostile to the bill. Mr. Pierce is also for Cuba. But Marcy is not. And I fear that the South will be "gulled" by him on that question. As for myself I am for Cuba, and I think if our citizens see fit to go and rescue the Island from Spanish misrule and English abolition policy they ought not to be *punished* by us for so doing. In other words I am for repealing our laws which make it a misdemeanor and punishable to take part in such a struggle as it is believed will take place there between the planters and the Govmt before the legislative decree goes into effect in August next. If the people then resist I am for aiding them. It will be another St. Domingo struggle and any American in my opinion should feel a sympathy for his own race. I am against Cuba's becoming a *negroe state*. But again enough. Excuse my haste. I have but a few moments to scribble you these lines. I hope to see you before many months and talk over these things. But I must repeat once more that my strong desire is to get out of this bustle and retire to the quiet and repose of my own sequestered home and leave the world to take [care] of itself.

My best respects to Mrs. Burch and kind regards to all the family.

Yours most sincerely

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

Robert S. Burch, Esq  
Marietta  
Ga

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*The Great Persian War and its Preliminaries; A Study of the Evidence, Literary and Topographical.* By G. B. GRUNDY. (London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xiii, 591.)

THE author of this ambitious and important monograph spent the winter of 1892-1893, the summer of 1895 and the summer of 1899 in Greece and in the course of these visits examined the principal military routes used in ancient times and the most famous battle-fields. Thus equipped with an accurate knowledge at first hand of the theater of operations, he has studied afresh the literary evidence concerning the Persian wars, with a view to settling the political, strategical and tactical questions to which it has given rise and incidentally to determining the character of Herodotus as an historian.

What gives his book its unique value is its topographical apparatus. This includes not only notes made in all parts of the field but also the results of especially careful observation in the plain of Marathon and the strait of Salamis, both already surveyed by others, and above all detail maps of Thermopylæ and Plataea, as surveyed the first time by Mr. Grundy himself. His analysis of this material, which is illustrated by a large number of original sketches and some photographic views, must be taken into account in all future discussion of the four great battles of the war and the campaigns that hinged upon them.

While at work in the field Mr. Grundy naturally depended upon the evidence of his own eyes. In reporting physical data he could afford to ignore the opinions of those who had never seen the ground. It would seem as if this had led him to believe that, in the very different work of interpreting the literary tradition in the light of this new evidence, he could safely rely, to an altogether undue extent, upon his own unaided reason. Except in a few instances, he has entirely failed to assimilate the contributions which others have made toward the solution of his problems or to test his own conclusions by entering fully into their arguments. He discusses consequently a vast amount of irrelevant detail, raises old difficulties long since solved, proposes rejected explanations, and proves over again established conclusions. The half of his book would be more than the whole.

It is now fifteen years since Hans Delbrück in his *Perserkriege und Burgunderkriege* laid the basis for all future treatment of the military and literary problems of the Persian wars. This book is nowhere named by Mr. Grundy. Its author is mentioned twice, each time in a foot-note.

Thus we read on page 210, in support of the statement that some modern writers have underestimated the size of Xerxes's army: "*E. g.* Delbrück attributes to Xerxes an army of from 65,000 to 75,000 combatants." Now this is a question of fundamental importance and, whether Delbrück's estimate be right or wrong, the very remarkable chain of argument by which he led up to it, deserves consideration. Mr. Grundy writes as if he had never read it and although he admits that the figures given by Herodotus are impossible, yet he concludes solely from the extent of the Persian Empire and from the Oriental reliance upon numbers that 500,000 should be regarded as the minimum figure for the troops employed on land. How such a force, with at least an equal number of non-combatants could be maintained in Greece, how it could be manipulated on the battle-field, or how such an overwhelming predominance of numbers on one side can be reconciled with the actual conduct of the war, he omits to explain in the course of the few sentences with which the whole matter is dismissed.

His survey of Thermopylæ and his examination of the strait of Salamis were not made until the summer of 1899. In November of the same year, in ample time for him to use it, appeared the second volume of Eduard Meyer's *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*. However difficult it may have been for him at that advanced stage to adopt a truly critical attitude towards Herodotus, for whom indeed he claims extraordinary accuracy in the statement of facts, he might at least have learned from Meyer not to credit the legend that the Greek fleet on the eve of Salamis was in a state of panic nor to repeat the charge that Leonidas was sacrificed by the failure of his government to reinforce him. According to Meyer's view, the force under Leonidas was large enough to hold the pass until the Greek fleet at Artemisium should engage the Persian ships, and no force that Sparta could furnish could have done more. The hesitation of the fleet to risk a decisive battle made the position on land untenable.

Delbrück and Meyer agree in urging on general principles that such a position as that at Thermopylæ can always be turned sooner or later. Both mention the road from Malis into Doris as a possible route by which the turning movement might have been made. In controverting Delbrück's statement of the case, Mr. Grundy adduces real grounds against the assumption that this road existed in ancient times but fails entirely to meet the main point,—the force of which, for instance, the Mexicans at Cerro Gordo and the Confederates at Rich Mountain found out to their cost. He emphasizes the connection between the Greek positions at Artemisium and Thermopylæ, ascribing to them, however, co-ordinate importance, but he ignores Bury's article in the *Annual of the British School at Athens* for 1895-1896 to which Meyer, in discussing the same question, has acknowledged his indebtedness. It is curious to note further that, while acknowledgment is made of another article of Bury's—year and volume not given (p. 389)—the explanation of the Scythian expedition suggested by the same scholar in the *Classical Review* for



July 1897 is mentioned as "a theory which has recently been put forward," without further identification. It is difficult to account for this haphazard method of reference. Often enough Mr. Grundy shows his capacity to learn, if he will, from others. Thus, in the chapter on Salamis he accepts, with ample recognition, Professor Goodwin's view as to the Persian position—that it was outside, not inside the entrance to the strait—and repeats the arguments on which it was based, reinforcing them by observations of his own. He finds it impossible, however, to reconcile this with the account given by Herodotus and offers an ingenious explanation of the latter's mistake; but he neglects to tell us of the manner in which Goodwin so interpreted the crucial passage in Herodotus as to bring it into harmony with the testimony of Æschylus and the nature of the scene of action.

After all that has been said in criticism of Mr. Grundy's method, it is only fair to repeat that large parts of his book possess permanent value. His chapter on Plataea especially will repay careful study. It is to be hoped that he will carry out his purpose to deal in another volume with the remaining campaigns of the fourth century, but no less to be desired that, in expressing his opinion of the strategy of Pericles and the authority of Thucydides, he will not overlook two books which have appeared since his first one was written. One of these is the first volume of Delbrück's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* and the other is the fourth volume of Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums*.

H. A. SILL.

*Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters.* Von JULIUS KAERST. Erster Band. Die Grundlegung des Hellenismus. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1901. Pp. x, 433.)

THE author has for some years been favorably known as a critical student of the sources for the history of Alexander, and his articles in historical and philological periodicals have roused expectation of some such general historical work as that of which the first volume is now before the world. "Ich habe mir die Aufgabe gestellt," he explains in his preface (p. iv), "die Umwandlung des in den engen Grenzen der Polis sich darstellenden Staates in die umfassenden politischen Gestaltungen der hellenistischen Zeit und der in der hellenischen Polis erwachsenen Kultur in die hellenistischen Weltkultur nachzuweisen und das Wesen dieser neuen universalen Bildungen, die treibenden Kräfte, die wichtigsten Entwicklungstendenzen derselben darzulegen."

The first volume is exclusively devoted to the political philosophy of the evolution of Alexander's world-sovereignty. Of the economical, social, artistic and religious aspects of the Hellenistic as contrasted with the Hellenic period, subsequent volumes will doubtless treat. For a history of the period "grossen Stiles," we must still go to Droysen; for detailed pragmatic history, with exhaustive apparatus, to Niese. Of the first predecessor in the field, the author speaks everywhere with due apprecia-

tion; of the second no mention whatever is made in the preface, and none in the main text of the work. Less than a dozen references to him in the foot-notes are without exception controversial and even deprecatory, though neither in this nor in any other case is the author's controversial procedure virulent or undignified. With Hogarth's recent book the author shows a slight acquaintance, and honors it with a somewhat disdainful reference.

The main tendencies of the work are perfectly clear. Toward our tradition of the histories of Philip and Alexander of Macedon, the author takes a distinctly conservative position, and the kernel of historical truth within the husk of romantic accretion is, as a rule, carefully sought. There is refreshingly little of the arbitrary subjective pronunciamiento so prevalent in much recent work on ancient history among the Germans. Toward the personalities of Philip and Alexander the attitude is consistently favorable, not to say apologetic, and yet admiration and praise are never allowed to escape the most perfect control. Dignity even to heaviness characterizes the whole work; plan and method are noble and sedate. Military details and attractive anecdotes obscure in wonderfully slight degree the main political thread of the argument. Alexander's siege of Tyre is disposed of in less than two pages; his capture of the Aornos fastness in a brief sentence, and as a result of this self-control, the conception of the Greek *Polis*, with which the volume opens, is given a truly artistic contrast to that of Alexander's world-swaying personality, with which the volume closes.

The Battle of Chæroneia decided the claims of city-state and monarchical supremacy to the leadership of Hellas. The Athenian city-state, during its leadership, had slowly lost sight of the national, Pan-Hellenic idea, in attempting to satisfy the local and social demands of its sovereign democracy. Sparta and Thebes, during their leaderships, had been unable to triumph over city-state exclusiveness and achieve a general Pan-Hellenic symmarchy. Persia had become the chief power in Hellas. Meanwhile, in spiritual, economical and political life, the technical superiority of the gifted individual was seeking and obtaining scope for itself. The Socratic doctrine of "knowledge" favored the conception and realization of a technically skilled bureaucracy and a technically qualified individual leader of the state. The Macedonian monarchy, as developed by Philip II., and as enlarged by Alexander, furnished both individual leader and trained bureaucracy. Philip II. won for this political system the leadership of Hellas.

The Macedonians were a distinct folk from the Hellenes, but nearly related to them, more nearly than any of their neighbors were, or than they were to any of their neighbors. The royal line were of genuine Macedonian stock. Their pure Hellenic origin was a political fiction of great influence in the Hellenizing process which had been under way long before Philip II., but which was not complete till the time of Perseus. The Macedonian monarchy, with its elastic principles of folk and territorial unity, contrasts fully with the city-state's separation and

exclusiveness. Philip II. based it more broadly than ever on the people, at the expense of the nobility. The vigor of the monarchy in Hellas had been appropriated by laws and constitutions until monarchy had become a mythical memory. But when new intellectual and social currents brought the monarchical ideal again into prominence, lo ! the court of an Archelaüs could attract a Euripides. The monarchical folk of Macedonia had developed a political system which was to wrest to itself the leadership of Hellas and show itself capable of swaying the inhabited world.

Demosthenes was champion of the *Polis*, as a sovereign political system ; Philip of the democratic monarchy. Demosthenes led a pathetic, but not a Pan-Hellenic struggle. The Macedonian monarchy was a better spreader of Hellenic culture than the isolating city-state colonial system ; but the culture was the peculiar product of the city-state principle. The Macedonian Empire at last achieved what Pericles attempted in vain.

Philip's conquest of the leadership of Hellas was primarily in the interests of Macedonia rather than of Hellas ; then such a humiliation of Persia, the deposed Great Power of Hellas, as was consistent with a monarchy based on the Macedonian folk and culminating in the leadership of Hellas, doubtless lay in Philip's plans. Even the retaliatory idea in Persian punishment was not too romantic for a monarch who had posed as a champion of Apollo ! The creation and the development of the Corinthian national Assembly was Philip's greatest Hellenic service. This was an instrument of wonderful scope and power. It marked, not the end of Hellenic freedom, but the consummation of Hellenic unity.

Over against the organic unity of the Macedonian monarchy under Philip is set, by way of contrast, the vast aggregation of the Persian Empire under Darius III., with its disintegrating tendencies in active operation notwithstanding the unifying cruelties of Assyria. From Philip's idea of humiliating this Great Power, and deposing it from supremacy in Hellenic politics by the concerted efforts of all Hellas under Macedonian leadership, Alexander passed by successive steps to the ideas of conquest and sway of the Persian Empire, conquest and sway of the East, conquest and sway of the world. He early freed himself, even at great loss in efficiency, from dependence on the Corinthian Assembly, and therefore from his father's narrower plans, and from exclusively Macedonian policies. His delay in pursuing Darius after the defeat at Issus, in order to conquer Egypt and secure the divine sanction of Ammon, indicates the inception in his mind of the idea of world-empire.

With the defeat of Agis at Megalopolis by Antipater, in 331, the powers and influence of the Corinthian Assembly practically ceased, and, at the death of Darius, Alexander assumed the Persian monarch's heritage. A Macedonian successor of the Achæmenids now exercised their domination in Hellenic matters, but the Macedonian folk-army, the national foundation for the successes of Philip and Alexander, underwent modification. The jealousies and hates arising in the process were curbed with savage and even faithless cruelty. There is ample political

apology for the deaths of Parmenio, Kleitos and Kallisthenes. The heritage of policy from Philip was ruthlessly discarded by Alexander during the very struggles in the heart of Iran (329-327 B. C.) whose success best attests the consummate wisdom and workmanship of Philip. The Macedonian folk-army won their victories only to lose their national monarchy. But Alexander had not deteriorated with his enormous successes—the popular error; he had risen to and adopted a world-policy which demanded the creation by assimilation of a world-folk.

The Indian expedition, long contemplated and prepared, was part of this world-policy, not merely the completion of a task left incomplete by Persia. And it was the physical and moral exhaustion of his new, conglomerate army, not rebellion against his world-policy, which stayed Alexander's progress eastward. He returned to establish a world-capital, to complete and organize his world-empire and above all to make the ocean his vassal and minister. Divine honors for the central and dominating personality in this world-empire were part of his policy, and no confines to that empire except those of the world itself were allowed. Macedonia and Hellas alike were politically sacrificed to this culminating vision of the greatest wielder of the destinies of the ancient world.

Such are the leading thoughts and tendencies of this able book. Following the lead of a seductive political philosophy, and ignoring the exaggerations of romantic tradition, it sets both Philip and Alexander on higher pedestals in the hall of fame than romantic tradition ever claimed for them.

B. PERRIN.

*The Ancient Catholic Church, from the Accession of Trajan to the Fourth General Council (A. D. 98-451).* By ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [The International Theological Library.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. xii, 539.)

THE editors of the "International Theological Library" have entrusted two volumes of the church history in their series to the venerable Dr. Rainy, of Edinburgh, his subject being Catholicism. The first of these lies before us. It comes down to the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. The second volume will cover the period of later catholicism, by which the author understands the history of the Church to Gregory I., or perhaps to Charlemagne, although his plan is to carry the narrative over two or three centuries more,—a "transition period,"—to Hildebrand. We may assume, no doubt, that in the present volume we have the facts which forty years' experience in teaching church history have convinced Dr. Rainy are most important for students of this period to know.

The book is divided into three parts: (1) to the close of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, (2) to the toleration edict of 313, (3) to the Fourth Council. The reasonableness of the first of these epochs is less obvious than that of the second. Why should a church historian select "the accession of Trajan," or of any other emperor to mark a turning point in

his narrative? For him to borrow epochs from political history is as unscientific as it would be for an historian of politics to make a dividing line out of the Monophysite controversy, or for a writer on economic history to date a period from the publication of *Paradise Lost*. It is a pity that every ecclesiastical historian, before attempting to map out his chronology, does not read, mark and inwardly digest Baur's *Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*. He might not accept Baur's periods, but he would at least be impressed with the necessity of having ecclesiastical affairs control his whole chronological scheme.

Dr. Rainy distributes his materials under comparatively few and simple rubrics, such as "Environment," "Church Life," "Beliefs and Sacraments," "Heresies," "Worship," the "Clergy," "Discipline and Schism," "Monasticism," and "Ecclesiastical Personages." Relatively greater space is devoted to matters of doctrine than to the institutional side of the history (*e. g.*, church organization, government, law and ritual). Almost half the total number of chapters discuss doctrine, heresy and schism. The geographical extension of Christianity receives little attention. But in this distribution of emphasis our author simply follows the example of most Protestant historians before him. Dr. Rainy's style is clear and straightforward. Details are kept in the background, and the main features of the history are made to stand out prominently. The chapter on Gnosticism may serve as an example of excellent historical exposition, well conceived and well carried out (pp. 94-119). And there are others as good. The author is on the whole fair-minded, and does not obtrude his theological prejudices upon his readers. His candor enables him to deal with vexed questions with a more even-handed justice than one often finds in similar works.

On the other hand, there are disappointing features in the book. We are obliged to look in several different places for information on some subjects whose treatment should be unified. Take for instance the Paschal controversy. Why must we turn from p. 81 ff. to p. 236 ff., before we discover all that Dr. Rainy wishes to tell us about it? Or in reading of the *libellatici*, why must we pass from p. 15, where they do not belong, to p. 142 ff., where they do belong but are hardly mentioned, and from there to p. 191,—and after all fail to find any description of the ancient *libelli*, from the Decian persecution, which have recently been discovered? Among the more striking cases of insufficient treatment, we mention the early history of the British Church, the general change from primitive to Catholic Christianity, the growth of the New Testament canon, and the development of the Roman primacy.

A few errors have crept into the book. What evidence is there that baptizing in the name of Christ alone was "always rather questionable" (p. 75)? If Papias is "usually placed about A.D. 145-160" (p. 60), we confess never to have heard of it. Papias's work entitled *Interpretations* contained five books, not "four" (*ibid.*). Cyprian's death is placed three years too late (p. 197). Apollonius of Tyana seems, in one passage (p. 155, n. 2), to be regarded as a contemporary of Plotinus,

but in another we are more accurately informed (p. 283). Rufinus's Latin versions of Origen's works are euphemistically called "translations" (p. 501). It is unfair to Cyprian, if to no others, to assert that all which was greatest in Christian literature down to the year 313 had been written before the year 230 (p. 157). There is carelessness in citing titles: e. g., Irenæus is credited with having written a "*Refutatio*" (p. 112), and Tertullian's work *De testimonio animæ* has received the gratuitous addition of "naturaliter christianæ" (p. 187).

We have noted the following typographical errors: P. 3, for Neumann's "*Römische Staat*" read *Römischer Staat*. P. 51 (twice) for "Funck" read Funk. P. 157, for Celsus's *Ἀληθὺς Λόγος* read Ἀληθὺς Λόγος. P. 161, for Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* read *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. P. 118, for metaphysical "identities" read entities.

The attempts at bibliography form the worst feature of the book. Very few of them are up to date. At the head of each chapter references to the literature are meager, and resort is had to the inconvenient device of a bibliographical appendix (added at the instigation of the editors?), which is also very unsatisfactory. Chapter XIX., on "The Clergy," refers to only two authorities; one is Bingham, the other still older. For information on "Objects of Worship" (p. 451) we are referred to nothing more recent than 1755! But it is only fair to Dr. Rainy to add that his own history is much more up to date than his literary references.

This book illustrates the disadvantages which inhere in the production of a "series." Drs. Briggs and Salmond started out to give the world a modern and scholarly theological library. But it appears to have been impossible to secure uniform merit in all parts of the series. It would have been a notable achievement indeed if all the volumes could have reached the high level of Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, or McGiffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*.

JOHN WINTHROP PLATNER.

*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century.* By TERROT REAVELEY GLOVER, M.A. (Cambridge: The University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xvi, 398.)

Books like this go far toward withstanding the anti-classical tendency of modern education. It is an encouraging sign of the power which Greek and Roman culture still possess that we should have Comparetti's great work, and that it should be followed by such books as Dill's *Roman Society*, Taylor's *Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, and the work before us,—to mention no others. To be sure, none of these books deals directly with the classical period. Yet through the history and literature of the early Middle Ages through knowledge of its social life, and through observation of the working even of the decadent classical spirit, we may learn to seek the fountain-head, whence these streams flowed. So we are grateful to Professor Glover, and the rest, for their leadership



in this educational circuit. We enjoy tarrying with them by the way, for they offer us pleasant fruits, if not the apples of the Hesperides or the honey of Hymettus, and from them we derive needed refreshment for our inevitable journey through certain barren stretches of the modern world.

Mr. Glover's book is made up of historical and literary essays. The author truly says of the fourth century that its literature is hardly known to-day, even to educated men. By "reading across the period" he hopes to show that it is not without vitality and interest, and we may say, once for all, that he succeeds. The writers discussed include Ammianus Marcellinus, Julian, Quintus of Smyrna, Ausonius, Symmachus, Macrobius, Augustine, Claudian, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, Palladas and Synesius. If the treatment of a few of these seems to lack freshness, it is not because the author is not independent, but because other scholars have recently traversed the same ground. It is hard to say much that is new about Julian, interesting as that emperor undeniably is. Dill has, if anything, overemphasized the history of Symmachus. Harnack's admirable pamphlet on Augustine's *Confessions* leaves little more to be said on that subject. But no one can read Mr. Glover's charming account of Ausonius, or of Synesius, without wishing to know them better. The chapters on "Women Pilgrims" and "Greek and Early Christian Novels" will open a new field to those not already familiar with the history of the early Church. As for Quintus of Smyrna, Macrobius and Palladas, they may be said to have needed this re-introduction to the modern world.

It is no reflection upon Mr. Glover's learning to say that the essays are not always critical. He does not write wholly, or even mainly, for experts, but addresses the more general audience of cultivated men and women everywhere. Accordingly he writes, not with the technicalities of criticism, but with insight and fairness, with sympathy and appreciation. In the general history of the period he follows Boissier, making frequent appeal also to Seeck. On the patristic side his authorities are not so good. We have noticed an occasional slip with reference to the Church, but mostly on controverted points, where difference of opinion is pardonable. The reviewer thinks it entirely inadequate to say that the episcopate grew out of the presidency of Roman (Christian) burial associations (p. 16). A perusal of Conybeare's book entitled *Philo about the Contemplative Life* ought to have convinced Mr. Glover that Philo did write that work after all (p. 360). The *Life of Antony* may very well be from Athanasius's pen, in spite of Weingarten's effort to reclaim it "for its anonymous author" (p. 386).

Our author's English style is on the whole unusually good, so that his occasional lapses into carelessness are all the more surprising. We struggle in vain to disentangle the mixed metaphor, when we read that "sudden wealth joined forces with a flippant scepticism to sap the Roman character" (p. 4); and we wonder whether it was Hibernian humor which made Mr. Glover say that the plague "contributed to the depopulation" of the empire (p. 8). We like better to call attention to his

fine metrical translation of Prudentius's description of heaven and hell (p. 259), which shows him to be possessed of no mean literary gifts. On the whole the book is to be distinctly commended.

JOHN WINTHROP PLATNER.

*Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit.* Vergleichende Entwicklungs-  
geschichte der führenden Völker Europas und ihres sozialen und  
geistigen Lebens. Von KURT BREYSIG. Zweiter Band. Alter-  
thum und Mittelalter als Vorstufen der Neuzeit. Zweiter Hälfte.  
(Berlin: Georg Bondi. 1902. Pp. xxxix, 519-1443.)

A BOOK with the title of *Kulturgeschichte* comes ill-recommended to American readers. The German word *Kulturgeschichte* is about equivalent to kaleidoscope. A book appears with a number of interesting facts arranged in the frame of some theory, the next book shows the same facts broken up in new combinations; the pictures are brilliant, the books are easy reading, but the increase of knowledge with the turn of the kaleidoscope is desperately small. There are honorable exceptions to this, Lippert's book, for instance, and among the exceptions the present volume by Breysig will take its place. The author is known already to the stricter class of historians by his work on the history of Brandenburg. While he has devoted to the history of the Brandenburg finances and estates the painstaking care in investigation and the sober exposition which those subjects demanded he has taken the opportunity in his lectures at the University of Berlin to develop his gift for generalization in the line of sociology and the philosophy of history, and he presents in this essay the product of a combination of philosopher and historian. It is proper and necessary, as he has said elsewhere, for historians to pause sometimes in their accumulation of details, and to take stock in general terms of the advances that they have made; he has set himself to this task in the present work, of which the first volume appeared in 1900, and which will require a number of volumes yet for its completion.

The volume under review, covering the Middle Ages to the thirteenth century falls into two parts, of which the first is devoted to the rise of Christianity. This topic, more important, as Breysig says, than all others in the spiritual development of mankind, has already been worked up so thoroughly that he has wisely restricted his treatment of it to less than two hundred pages. In that compass he describes, in a rationalistic but thoroughly sympathetic tone, the development of the Christian dogma and the Church, and gives an appreciation of the significance of Christianity to civilization. Breysig treats the religion almost entirely from the standpoint of social, not personal, humanity, and from that standpoint finds the effect of Christ's teachings to have been, in briefest terms, an elevation of the individual, but the repression of personality (p. 602). "Jesus' Religion war aller geistigen, politischen und materiellen Kultur abgeneigt" (p. 587).

The bulk of the volume treats of the Germanic peoples from the time of the migrations through the transition period of the Middle Ages. Some of the sections are characteristic of the old style "history of civilization," discussing topics in literature and science, art and religion, passing from concrete descriptions of individual poems and buildings to broad and vague statements of the relations between the subjects considered, hovering always between the danger of saying something unimportant and the danger of saying something untrue. I will cite only one example of the perils which the author has not always escaped, taken from his discussion of the relation of the papacy to the crusades (pp. 864-865). The first and fourth Crusades, he says, were those most influenced by the Church; it is "characteristic" and furnishes a "vivid proof" of the leadership of the papacy, that both of these Crusades resulted in the foundation of international colonies in the east. Surely it would be hard to distort more completely the significance of the fourth Crusade, and the parts played in it by the papacy and by Venice.

A large part of the book, however, a part to which the reader refers with increasing pleasure and profit, is of a very different kind; the statements are exact, they are thoroughly organized, and they furnish comparisons and conclusions which will be of the greatest assistance to students seeking acquaintance with the broader lines of European political development. This part may be called a comparative constitutional history. Those who followed Breysig's articles in Schmoller's *Jahrbuch* from 1896 on, will find the methods which he applied there so successfully to the period since the Reformation applied now to the early Middle Ages. The organization of Germany, France, England, Italy, the Spanish and Scandinavian states and the Netherlands, is described in terms applicable to all the countries: terms of economic organization in agriculture, commerce and industry; terms of social-political organization, peasant, noble, burgher. Never before has there been brought out so clearly the general similarity in the institutions of the peoples of western Europe, a similarity which stimulates both by likeness and by contrast, and which gives new meaning to the old facts of history. The main features of political and economic organization are suited to a much broader treatment than that which they have generally received, and Breysig shows in handling them an admirable judgment in avoiding insignificance either of detail or of generalization. He has a wholesome distrust of the abstract theories which would distribute influences among the economic, social and political factors in history, and decides each case according to the facts; he grants the decisive influence of an economic factor in one case (rise of the city classes), and denies it in another (rise of the nobility). As the source of his information he is forced of necessity to rely almost entirely on secondary authorities, but he draws them from a wide range and selects them with discrimination.

Breysig calls his book a *Versuch*, and even the part of it to which I have just referred, the most definite and substantial of the book, can be regarded only as a stepping-stone to fuller knowledge. The time was

ripe, however, for such a work, and the work is worthy of the time; students of constitutional history will find no book more helpful in stimulating them to broader views. A feature which will increase its usefulness is a very full table of contents.

CLIVE DAY.

*The Early History of Venice.* From the Foundation to the Conquest of Constantinople, A. D. 1204. By F. C. HODGSON. (London: George Allen. 1901. Pp. xx, 473.)

MR. HODGSON'S volume aims at presenting the history of Venice on a scale larger than that employed by Mr. Horatio F. Brown and smaller than Mr. W. C. Hazlitt's. A comparison of his work with theirs shows that it fills a field which theirs do not, and has, accordingly, a sufficient reason for being. Mr. Brown's plan precluded elaboration. Mr. Hazlitt is elaborate even to diffuseness, and in spite of all his immense knowledge of Venetian history and life, this diffuseness, coupled with a ponderous style, becomes at times wearisome. Mr. Hodgson, on the other hand, devotes much space to a critical analysis of his material without wholly exhausting the reader's patience. At his best, he is never so vivid as Mr. Hazlitt's best passages but his average is more satisfactory.

Mr. Hodgson differs from both Mr. Brown and Mr. Hazlitt in having made larger use than they of recent German material, and perhaps it is on this account that he inclines to accept their interpretation of some of the moot questions in early Venetian history. Chief among these questions is the determining of the exact relations of Venice to Byzantium during the first four centuries of the Republic's existence. Venetian historians have minimized the dependence; Mr. Hodgson, in common with Gfrörer, and, it should be added, with many earlier writers, seems to regard the dependence as so pressing that we must suppose that the early doges were Byzantine officers. The advocates of this view lay much stress on the facts that several of the doges held the title "*Hypatos*" from the Eastern Emperor, and that "*Magister Militum*" was "the title of a high functionary in the Byzantine Empire," as well as in Venice in the eighth century. But in the absence of final proof, which has not yet been produced, I believe that the other view is preferable. The key to Venetian history down to the twelfth century is the adroitness with which the statesmen of the Lagoons steered their safe course between the Western Empire and the Eastern, always siding, in case of danger, with the more remote. That the Byzantine influence was great, cannot be disputed, but it never, so far as I recall, took the form of political dictation. If Venice had actually been a Byzantine dependency, it is incredible that from 460 to 1160 we should have no record of an attempt to set up imperial governors, or to exert active imperial authority in the Venetian community. Titles, of themselves, prove little, and it is certain that the Venetians rendered lip-service to the Frankish emperors as compliantly as to the Greek: they rendered lip-service, and then went on their own political road undisturbed.

But to criticise a single point is hardly just, unless the critic has much space at his command. Even readers who are well-informed on Venetian history, will find throughout Mr. Hodgson's book so careful an analysis of material that it will be worth their while to consult it. He has evidently studied the sources at first hand, and not merely the early chronicles, but also the philologists, Ducange and Diez, for the light they can throw on the early medieval customs and titles. He has studied carefully minute details of geography, on a knowledge of which the solution of many problems depends. He is least satisfactory in failing to give from time to time illuminating summaries of the course of events, and in missing legitimate opportunities for vivid description. The meeting of Pope Alexander III. and Frederick Barbarossa at Venice, for instance, was one of the transcendent episodes in medieval history; to describe it in the colorless language which might suit the minutes of a missionary society meeting, betrays either unusual insensibility or timidity on the part of the historian. Probably Mr. Hodgson was afraid to let himself go, lest by being fervent he might be suspected of inaccuracy. But surely that is a false view of writing history which forbids one to treat great events greatly, and which hopes to attain to a specious veracity by using the same language and the same scale for great and small.

Mr. Hodgson's last chapter, in which he tells the story of the fourth Crusade, is the most interesting, perhaps because he wisely gains vividness by frequent reference to the delightful old Villehardouin. He also discusses fully the charge that the Venetians, in diverting the Crusade, acted in bad faith. He keeps his judgment clear amid the ethical tangle in which Innocent III. involved the crusaders. An appendix contains an excursus on the sources for the history of the fourth Crusade.

To sum up: Mr. Hodgson's success has been sufficient in this volume to warrant his going forward and completing the history. Painstaking and fairness are indispensable foundations to any historical work; if to these he will add enthusiasm, a more effective style, and a full recognition that the men who made history were once really alive, his later volumes will be better than his first. He provides a good index, but his single page of *errata* does not give half of them. English scholars seem to be congenitally indifferent to the spelling of foreign words.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

*A Short History of Germany.* By ERNEST F. HENDERSON. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Two vols., pp. x, 517; vii, 471.)

IN the delightful *Letters* of the historian Green, there are repeated passages in which the author tries to distinguish between his own conceptions and methods and those of what he calls the pragmatic historians of the German school. The expression is a good one and can be applied in its full validity to the present work. Mr. Henderson has given us a pragmatic history. Indeed it would be curious if a man who bears the manifest hall-mark of the German seminar, who shows the widest

acquaintance with German historical resources and a profound sympathy with German ways of thought, who, in a word, has been admitted into the German house upon an intimate footing, it would be curious, I say, if the confirmed habits and established environment of such a man did not proclaim themselves in the lineaments of his work. But I hasten to add that the pragmatic method and the general German derivation of these volumes imply no surrender of his racial personality on the author's part. If the pragmatic note is largely the consequence of the too exclusive ideal of correctness, and if this ideal may, in summary terms, be declared to be the goal of German *Wissenschaft*, it must be granted on the other hand that Mr. Henderson has not forgotten that the literary or humanistic ideal, for which Green, for example, in his above-mentioned letters contends, has still a strong hold upon the cultured world, and in a book like this, intended not merely for university consumption, must imperatively be represented. The solid and scientific character of the book will be found to be preserved from anything like the heaviness, which is associated with so many otherwise excellent German works, by a certain mental vivacity, which never flags and which gives to each paragraph an inner sparkle and to the whole story something at least of its necessary epic movement.

It is not apparent why a work, embracing two very stout volumes, should be denominated a "Short History," except to convey the obvious information that there have been omissions, and to afford the author a shelter against criticisms on that score. It hardly seems necessary for Mr. Henderson to have adopted that device, but his having done so brings before us that he must have been considerably troubled about the question of what material he would introduce within his given frame, embarrassed as he was by a wilderness of riches. And this question, which is a question of proportions, is indeed in every general work an all-important one. The author solved it finally by conceiving of the history of Germany as a stream, which swells by constant and regular stages to a mighty river, and becomes important in measure as it approaches its mouth. In consequence, to the whole medieval period is devoted no more than about one half of the first volume, while the second volume is to all intents and purposes a history of Prussia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Obviously this theory and its results are open to criticism, but it must be acknowledged that the author has kept his prime conception consistently before him and carried through its application with much skill. Still, whether owing to this preconceived plan or not, there are omissions which leave a keen regret, and with all due respect to the author's freedom to define his own task, cannot easily be justified. I do not of course speak of the hundreds of details about which every one has his own notions and preferences, and regards as petty or essential according to his philosophy and temperament; I refer to the very slight treatment which the author accords the matter of German civilization—to *Kulturgeschichte*, and to the oblivion or at least neglect, to which he condemns the constitutional history of the country. Thus though the



paragraphs on the periods of the Hohenstaufen and the Reformation may still pass muster as partial pictures of the life of these two great epochs, the total absence of the eighteenth century revival, by which were laid the foundations of the modern science, and as many think of the modern power of Germany, must be felt as a painful gap ; and in the matter of the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire the great stages in its evolution can hardly be said to be discussed with the requisite incisiveness. The stem duchies are passed over ; not a word will be found on the immensely important culmination of what German writers call the *Lehnstaat* under Frederick Barbarossa ; and if the development of the Prussian administration and the reforms of Stein inspire the author to some of his most vigorous pages, this pleasant gift is offset by his refusal to give us anything like an adequate analysis of the present German constitution and of its fate since 1871. Perhaps it is correct to explain such omissions by the resolutely pragmatic character of the work. The author deals with events, that is, with the dynamic element of history, and has no time to interrupt the march of politics with legal, constitutional, or philosophical reflections. Even his many pen-portraits of great men exhibit this predilection. They never fail to contain weighty matter, being the product of a method which has gone straight to the sources, but though they are uniformly excellent readings of the subject's mind, they are deficient in color and play of light, qualities which come from looking at a subject in a variety of ways.

New and startling views are not characteristic of this work. With unflagging industry the author has assimilated a vast material, with ripe judgment he has weighed it. The result is a whole enveloped in an atmosphere of dignity and authority. One could differ as to numberless details. The author is very severe upon Philip of Hesse, Luther's landgrave ; he ascribes the burning of Magdeburg without question to its inhabitants ; his association of Frederick the Great's *Histoire de mon Temps* with Cæsar's literary work would indicate that he has only the school-boy's irritated recollection of the Gallic War ; he does the French Assembly scant justice in reviewing its motives for declaring the war of 1792. In every chapter the specialist of that field could find some phrase that might advantageously be altered, a judgment that has neglected some points of evidence ; and from first to last a carping reviewer might object that the author is plainly prejudiced in favor of his subject. But in this connection Mr. Henderson, perhaps, remembered the wise word of Goethe, to the effect that only he who writes of a matter with favorable bias can hope to bring forth anything of profit.

In conclusion, to say that Mr. Henderson has given us the best history of Germany in the English language is no great praise. The open-minded reader will feel no desire to express his opinion so ambiguously. He will be constrained to acknowledge that this work need not fear the comparison with German works of similar scope, and that its erudition, liveliness, and sympathetic tone are calculated to insure its success with both the university and the general public.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

*The French People.* By ARTHUR HASSALL. [The Great Peoples Series.] (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1901. Pp. xii, 400.)

THE history of the French, according to the main argument of this book, is the history of centralization in government. Though composed of race elements which were somewhat discordant, divided into separate states for many centuries, and into hostile creeds for generations more, the people of France have steadily worked toward a compact union under strong rulers. This goal was at first reached under a monarchy, and the nation attained its harmonious development under Louis XIV. But the incapacity of the royal financiers, and the unjust levies of taxes paved the way for the French Revolution. Napoleon brought order out of confusion, established equality of citizenship before the state treasury, and founded an administration, which has survived the political disturbances of a hundred years, and which seems destined to last. The growth of the trades classes and artisans, and the influence of the Church were also important factors in bringing about royal supremacy. Territorial feudalism had practically disappeared by the thirteenth century, but was soon replaced by the feudalism of appanage. Agincourt, with its slaughter of nobles, and Joan of Arc, with her appeal to patriotism, saved the King, and Louis XI. made his position secure. Freed from danger at home, with a united nation behind it, the royal court turned its attention towards foreign conquests, and with the exception of the generation of the religious wars and the regencies of the seventeenth century, European politics and plans of colonial aggrandizement occupied the thoughts of the French until the advent of Louis XVI. Napoleon inherited a part of this tradition and aimed at a world-empire. Since Waterloo colonization has seemed the more feasible, though the present republic is not at all unmindful of foreign alliances.

The longest chapter (pp. 309-362) is devoted to a history of the foreign relations of France. In spite of the decay of the aristocracy and the alliance of the king and people, "of all European nations, France has been the most willing to sacrifice constitutional progress for military glory" (p. 309). Foreign affairs would also appear to possess unusual interest for the author. At least, this is the only part of his narrative which deals with minutiae, witness the short monograph (pp. 334-354) on the affair of Nootka Sound in 1790.

As the purpose of the book is to show the development of French society in its broader lines, but little attention is paid to current happenings, and dates are few. The pressure of material is so great as to affect the author's style at times, especially in the earlier chapters. These read more like lectures, with repetitions of phrases and a confused presentation. The proof-reading has been hurried and perhaps not done by the writer himself. Notice attached (p. 9), 446 (p. 15), Sancerre (p. 50), the Sorbonne founded in 1202 (p. 99), Henry II. (p. 146) *sacred* (p. 196, sixth line), *prévaut* (p. 228), *provincial* government (p.

271, third line from end), and the dates for the various publications of the Romantic School (pp. 255-261). Certain statements are obscure. Thibaut (Theobald p. 70) of Champagne (p. 83) fought under Louis VIII., not under Simon de Montfort, as the order of events would indicate; Lafayette is *for* war with England (p. 344), and apparently *against* it (p. 356). Lamartine's *Jocelyn* (p. 260) is spoken of as prose, Hugo's *Han d'Islande* (l. c.) is made its contemporary, and George Sand (l. c.) is said to be a follower of Chateaubriand (not Châteaubriand—see index). The compliments paid to the École des Chartes (pp. 372, 373) seem, from the allusion to natural science, intended for the École des Hautes Études. As the subject of the volume is the "French People," the sentence devoted to the poetry of Richard the Pilgrim (not preserved in its original form) and the crusade songs of William IX. (lost), on page 76, might be fittingly expanded into a paragraph on the relation of the national epic of France to the popular enthusiasm for the conquest of the Holy Land. But, these are slight blemishes in a work which is both strong and suggestive.

The bibliography is well chosen and the index full and correct.

F. M. WARREN.

*The Two First Centuries of Florentine History: the Republic and Parties at the Time of Dante.* By Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by LINDA VILLARI. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xii, 576.)

PROFESSOR VILLARI'S history of Florence is a volume of nearly six hundred pages, made up for the most part of papers contributed to the *Nuova Antologia*, collected in 1895, and now given to the English-reading public. It is the result of a careful study of Florentine documents, critically applied to the statements of Villani and other early historians. The diction has the same characteristics of clearness and directness which have made the *Machiavelli* and the *Savonarola* so attractive; a Latin diction, refreshing after the kitchen-midden style of German composition. The translation is good, as might be expected from the experience of the translator, with here and there a reversion to the Italian idiom, as in the frequent use of "the which" for introducing relative clauses. The word "arisa" (p. 35 "the arisa of the communes") has an unfamiliar look. The book is plentifully supplied with illustrations, many of them reproductions of architectural remains of the Roman period.

Investigating the origins of Florence, as the community arose from the disastrous experiences of the Langobard invasion, Professor Villari seeks to steer a middle course between the chauvinistic conclusions of the German and the Latin schools. His judgment, however, and, perhaps, his sympathies reject the idea that the essential elements of reorganization are likely to have been contributed by the invaders. Why say, he suggests, that the Langobard invasion originated the new life following in Italy any more than that the French invasion of Napoleon, when the

French flag flew in every city in Germany, was responsible for the new Germanic impulse?

The main purpose of the author's labors, as stated in the introduction is, "to discover some leading thread through the mazes of Florentine history, which even when treated by great writers has often been found exceedingly involved and obscure." The early chroniclers were concerned with human passions and actions, and had little interest in the rise and growth of human institutions. They afford but little aid in determining such important events as the establishment of self-government in Florence. The documents themselves, in so far as they are at hand, are also inconclusive. The persistence of Roman terms over periods of important political change give an apparent similarity to institutions which are in reality widely divergent. The Florentine commune itself gives evidence of being well under way, when its independent character is first established from documentary evidence. This is due, in part at least, to the fact that the birth of the commune was unaccompanied with any great political upheaval. On the death of the Countess Matilda, in 1115, Tuscany was split into fragments by the dispute between Emperor and Pope. The fact that Henry IV. naturally leaned for support on the Germanic nobles of the *contado* threw the city into a position of hostility toward the imperial claims. Standing between the rival powers, too proud and too conscious of her strength to feel the need of subjecting herself to either, Florence found her advantage in independence. This implied no drastic change. The same *grandi*, who, under the mild rule of the Countess, had administered the affairs of the city in her name, continued to rule by the authority of the people, becoming consuls of the commune. In this manner a popular government was achieved with a minimum of change and invention. Popular choice, however, brought about a wider distribution of civic honors, and certain great clans, aggrieved at the loss of the monopoly of power they had enjoyed under the Countess, allied themselves to the imperial interests and brought about a division of the great families into Ghibellines and Guelphs, with the ensuing civil strife which forms the background of Dante's history.

Many other problems of early Florentine history are interestingly treated: the origin and rise of the Podestà; the repeated attempts to perfect the constitution; in Chapter VI. the rise of the wool-dyeing industry, and the subsequent development of weaving. That the Florentines should have been content for so long to import coarse "Frankish" stuffs from the looms of Flanders is due to the unfavorable attitude of the commune toward agriculture. The Italian wool, although extensively manufactured into coarse fabrics for domestic use, was of poor quality. No effort was made to improve the breed of sheep. Indeed, the laws and decrees relating to trade are full of good sense and foresight, while all concerning agriculture seem dictated by prejudice and jealousy. Chapter VII. is a study of the Florentine family in its relation to the state; Chapter VIII. treats of the judicial system; both institutions be-

ing carried through the late imperial, Langobard and republican times. The remaining two chapters deal with Dante and the social conditions of Florence in his day.

MERRICK WHITCOMB.

*Mediæval Rome, from Hildebrand to Clement VIII., 1073-1600.*

By WILLIAM MILLER. [The Story of the Nations Series.]

(New York : G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Pp. xiii, 373.)

THE object of the book, as stated in the preface, is to furnish to people who have not time to read the longer works, as Gregorovius, a short history of mediæval Rome, the author having especially in mind the numerous British and American visitors of that city. The work is based on the best secondary authorities, no claim to original research being made, except in so far as a thorough familiarity with modern Rome and other places alluded to in the text is concerned.

The extreme difficulty, perhaps impossibility, of giving a satisfactory brief popular account of Rome in the Middle Ages is here illustrated. The question immediately presents itself, what is to be done with the papacy. If we try to consider the city without the papacy its history during that time is, of all considerable Italian cities, the most petty and unprofitable. If we try to get an adequate understanding of papal history we are led far away from Rome, and our short history immediately expands to an impossible length. The present work tries to steer between these two alternatives by giving an account of those events in papal history that happened in or near Rome, and pretty thoroughly neglecting everything else. The result is in the last degree confusing. The uninformed reader can gain no intelligent notion whatever of the investiture contest or the conciliar movement of the fifteenth century, while the kidnapping of Gregory VII., the pageantry at the consecration of Innocent III., and the story of Djem are given much space. Even a matter so locally important as the territorial policy of the popes is treated in no connected and coherent manner. The author is chary of generalizations ; we are given no guiding threads to follow ; he writes like a chronicler recording what has happened from pontificate to pontificate, rarely seeking to show the connection with what goes before and what follows except where there is some supposed resemblance or analogy to something extremely modern. We are left in what was presumably the state of mind of some naïve and rather ignorant contemporary who saw many striking and bloody happenings at Rome, but was much in the dark as to what it was all about. It is a sort of truncated papacy that is given us, where all the more important sources and results of action lie in the portion that has been cut off.

After the papacy, the matter receiving most attention is the history of external material Rome ; to show how Rome as left by the emperors and early barbarians was modified, destroyed, or added to by popes or nobles during the mediæval period. Here is shown very full knowledge and careful study on the part of the author, but the practical use of the

book to the prospective visitor of Rome is much lessened by the way in which this material is presented, and perhaps has to be presented, the plan of the book remaining what it is. At the end of the account of each pope who left any important impress on Rome's external appearance is given a rather inchoate summary of the changes made throughout the city during his time. The fact that the buildings, streets, and monuments are not classified or grouped in any way, makes it extremely difficult to follow the history of any individual object; one would have to hunt through the whole book for it, and the index only very partially helps in this matter.

As to some minor matters, one feels at the conclusion of the book that many bloody and tragic details and accounts of ceremonial and pageantry might well have been omitted; they repeat themselves from pontificate to pontificate and century to century until one thoroughly tires of them, and there is a conviction that the author is underrating the calibre of his audience in giving them so much of this and so little intelligent interpretation and explanation. Also his very frequent allusions to present-day matters, brought in as if to enliven the subject and in language verging on the slangy or modern newspaper order but having no valid connection with the matter in hand, certainly add nothing to the force and clearness of the book and vitiate any dignity in its style.

A. B. WHITE.

*Edward Plantagenet (Edward I.), the English Justinian or the Making of the Common Law.* By EDWARD JENKS. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Pp. xxiv, 360.)

THIS volume sustains the high reputation already gained by the useful "Heroes of the Nations" series. The author apologizes "for the intrusion of a mere lawyer upon a scene so dominated by great historians," because he is unable to "understand how any one but a lawyer can possibly appreciate the true inwardness of Edward's reign." For "the Common Law which came into existence during his lifetime was, and is, the very picture of English national life, the concrete form into which the national spirit crystallizes with the moving centuries." Such an apology, it is to be hoped, will hereafter be unnecessary. Happily it is becoming pretty well recognized that a thorough treatment of institutional history implies a broad knowledge of law; just as an intimate acquaintance with the details of constitutional development is absolutely essential for a scientific study of jurisprudence. Indeed the most original and helpful parts of Mr. Jenks's book are those in which the great statutes of Edward's reign are analyzed and interpreted.

The first three chapters present a rapid but vigorous sketch of European history previous to the year 1250. Of these the first chapter, entitled "The Middle Ages in Europe," deals especially with the origin of feudalism and with the rise, decay, and revival of monastic institutions; the second, with the "Emergence of Modern Europe"; while the third draws a clear picture of "England in the Thirteenth Century," accent-



ing the economic and social conditions and explaining the meaning of the advent and influence of the friars of the order of St. Francis. The next three chapters give a concise history of Henry III.'s reign to the close of the Barons' War. Here the reader finds little with which he is not already familiar from the works of Stubbs and other writers, except that some new proofs and illustrations have been gleaned through an independent examination of the sources. The character and ability of Simon de Montfort are duly appreciated; and the crisis of 1258 is explained as mainly the result of the royal extravagance, the papal extortion, and the greed of the horde of foreign place hunters.

By far the most interesting portions of the book are the seventh, ninth and thirteenth chapters in which Edward's legislation and reformatory measures are discussed. The King's "first great act of home policy is significant. Two months had not elapsed since his return" from France after his father's death, "when he ordered a great enquiry into the feudal franchises." In England, feudalism had "shaped itself in conscious imitation of foreign models, and had aimed deliberately at reproducing the anarchic privileges of the Continental seigneur." Although this purpose was but partially realized, the "King's officials, traversing the land to exercise justice or to collect revenue found themselves met by claims of feudal privileges which deprived them of the power to exercise their most important duties." These claims were of course most pretentious in the palatinates, and in the "Marcher Earldoms on the Welch border, which came very near them in feudal independence." In 1274, therefore, a systematic visitation of all the franchises of England was made "on a scale like that of Domesday itself, with a view to ascertain the exact boundaries of feudal and royal jurisdiction." The "labour of the commissioners resulted in the following year, in the compilation of the Hundred Rolls, a record second only in importance to Domesday Book, as a picture of national life in a remote age." If the latter is the great Tax or Geld Book, the former is the great Franchise Book, of the medieval kingdom. The report of the commissioners was followed by the Eyre of 1279 which resulted in a conservative reform of existing abuses and put a stop to further encroachments. Scarcely less significant of Edward's policy is his earliest great law, "the famous statute of Westminster the First," adopted at a parliament of "magnates" in 1275, and designed to remedy the corruption and other abuses of the official system. But especially instructive is the author's discussion of the Statute of Merchants or Acton Burnell (1283) in its relation to the Statute of Entails or *De Donis* as the first chapter of the Statute of Westminster the Second (1285) is called. Before Edward's day the merchant could only with great difficulty enforce the payment of a debt. The "right of the creditor to seize the chattels of his debtor, through the hands of the sheriff, had become generally recognized. But the strongest instincts of feudalism were opposed to the suggestion that a debtor's land might be sold for payment of his debts, and a new tenant thus imposed upon his lord." The Statute of Merchants changed all

this. "If the debtor fails to pay, at the appointed time, he may not only be imprisoned, but his chattels and 'burgage' tenements (*i. e.*, lands in the borough) may be sold, without any preliminary proceedings, by the mayor to satisfy the debt, or if there is any difficulty in effecting the sale, the debtor's chattels and *all* his lands may be handed over at a reasonable valuation to the creditor, until, out of the issues, the debt is liquidated." The remedy was effective though radical. Hence, it is pointed out by Mr. Jenks, the institution of entails in the same year must be regarded as a kind of counter concession to the feudal aristocracy, which was rendered of little practical value through the later invention of the collusive action by common recovery.

Lack of space prevents further illustration of the author's discussion of Edward's constructive legislation. It must suffice to say that his book is a well-written and sound contribution to English constitutional history.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

*Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Révolution.* Par ERNEST LAVISSE. Tome IV. Les Premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans (1328-1422). Par A. COVILLE. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1902. Pp. 448.)

THE political and social transformations of France during the Hundred Years War were so remarkable, the evolution of institutions and ideas so rapid, the relations of France with foreign states so intricate, the military events so far-reaching in effect, that the co-ordination of these various classes of writing has really never been attempted by one historian to any great extent in this particular field. The distinction between classifications is as sharp as that between the constitutional history of England and its political and military history, without such a divorce in the writing thereof being possible in the case of France. The Battle of Poitiers had little effect upon the development of the English Parliament. It exerted an immense influence upon the political, institutional and social history of France.

M. Coville at the first blush seems to have achieved his task admirably. But examination discloses that he has limited himself almost wholly to French sources. The limitation was natural, perhaps even necessary, in view of the immensity of the subject, and would not have jeopardized the general result in almost any other period of French history; but the omission is unfortunate in this case. French and English history become in many ways the obverse and reverse side of the same thing during these centuries; not all the truth, and often not enough of the truth to make the treatment intelligible and just can be derived from one side exclusively.

In common with every French historian, M. Coville exaggerates the importance of Edward III.'s claim to the throne of France and the vexed question of liege homage. The first was not a cause of war at all, but merely a pretext to cover the real reasons of the English; and the question of homage was not a legal quibble merely. Edward was determined

not to perform liege homage until he was satisfied of his suzerain's intention to do him justice as a vassal of France. M. Coville omits to notice the important fact that Edward III. did not perform liege homage until the French government promised the redress of the injuries complained of by England. Edward III. is accused of playing a double game in making peace, though preparing for war and intriguing in Flanders. But why not Philip VI. also, not only in his relations to the Scotch, but in the unfair use made by him of the popes at Avignon?

Only half the truth will be learned from the French sources in the case of any great event. The history of Edward's campaign in Flanders and Picardy in 1339 is a one-sided account, for the author omits to mention the ravages of the English admiral, Sir Robert Morley, on the Norman coast, the fact that the Gascon nobles supported the French King, and that the French fleet was dispersed by a storm. A similar omission does injustice to the Flemings, for the circumstance that they were bound in the sum of two million *livres* penalty was a factor with their commercial interests in their desire that Edward III. should assume the French regal title. Van Artevelde's insistent overtures to Edward in 1342 are ascribed to the Flemish opposition to his domination and the policy of Louis of Nevers and the Duke of Brabant, the fact being ignored that the expiration of the truce of Esplechin threw Flanders back into a position of political peril independent of these influences.

The events preceding Crecy are clearly told, though there are some errors and one important omission. Edward arrived before Caen on July 26th and not on July 20th; the French constable was Raoul, not Robert de Brienne; the "count" of Tancarville was a simple sire. The omission is reference to the notable capture in the siege of Caen of the agreement made by the estates of Normandy with the crown in 1338, when a grand attack upon England was projected. The document was brought to England by the Earl of Huntingdon and publicly read by Archbishop Stratford in St. Paul's churchyard on August 12. Perhaps M. Coville regards it as a forgery of Edward to stimulate English feeling, but the English editor of Avesbury makes no doubt of its genuineness.

The chapter, "Le Gouvernement de Philippe VI.," is most excellent, and compensates the reader for the omissions of any notice either of the government of Lancaster in Guyenne—brief but valuable for the future history of the war—or of the English conduct of the war in Brittany. The reader would have been glad of an opinion upon the question of the immediate origin of the Jacquerie from so high an authority as the author, who is not so cautious in judging Étienne Marcel. The Peace of Brétigni is treated in all its phases save in the question of church property, provision for the restoration of which was introduced in the supplementary treaty of Calais, too important to be passed over without some allusion, especially in the light of the evidence collected by Father Denifle.

Nowhere, perhaps, is it more evident that the book has been written from French sources wholly than when the author is writing of Aquitaine

under the Black Prince. The policy of Charles V. was conspicuously able and the achievements of Du Guesclin remarkable. Yet part of the French success must be ascribed to the consummate folly of the Black Prince in the government of the south, and to the lack of efficient commanders among the English after the death of Sir John Chandos (1370), the noblest Englishman of them all; but the Prince's policy is dismissed in two lines and a half and Chandos's death not even mentioned.

After 1380 French history until Agincourt is less dependent upon English sources, and the latter portion of the book is less one-sided. It is strange, though, that when relying upon French sources merely, the French-Scotch alliance of 1383 to check the crusade of the bishop of Norwich in Flanders should fail of mention, the raid of the Scotch being later presented as an independent movement and one not inspired by France. This brevity to the point of sacrifice contrasts with the statement made relative to Philip Van Artevelde that "il avait rempli dans la ville quelques offices importants" (p. 278). The words seem superfluous, even untrue, unless there are Belgian authorities unknown to the eminent editor of Froissart.

When we come to the relations of France with the first Lancastrian King, the failure to use English sources still vexes the reader. A paragraph is devoted to an account of the vain-glorious challenge of the English King by the Duke of Orleans, as if it were of real historic importance. An examination of the first volume of the "Proceedings of the English Privy Council" would have cast a more valuable light upon the relations of the two countries and showed how French gold and guile fomented the Scotch war. A reference to Rymer would have trimmed the smoothness of this sentence: "Malgré tous ces défis, la trêve de vingt-huit ans fut expressément maintenue, confirmée tous les ans;" for as a matter of history, the English council was deliberating a declaration of war (Feb. 9, 1400) when the tardily approved truce (Jan. 29, 1400) was returned from Paris. Peace escaped into the temple of Janus by the narrow margin of eleven days!

The errors, fortunately, seem to be few; three of them (p. 37, 39, note, 58, note) are misprints in the case of English words. On p. 29, the affair of Cadzand happened November 9, 1337, and not in October; the bishop of Lincoln, instead of getting to Paris in 1337, as stated on p. 39, got no farther than Boulogne.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*Henry V. The Typical Mediæval Hero.* By CHARLES L. KINGSFORD. [Heroes of the Nations Series.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxxi, 418.)

THE successive volumes of the "Heroes of the Nations" series keep up to a very satisfactory grade of excellence. There are few if any of its volumes which fall below the standard of good serious historical work. Certainly this biography of Henry V. is no exception to the rule. It is based entirely on original authorities which are used with skill, care and

discretion. Moreover the combination of treatment of the more personal events of Henry's life, which are proper to a biography, with the more general description of the events of English history during that period, which is also necessary, is made with evident effort and with considerable success. The material left to us for showing the personality of any king or statesman of the fifteenth century, aside from the events of which he was a part, is scanty enough; and the life of Henry V., even more than the lives of others, was so completely bound up in his campaigns and diplomatic negotiations that the man apart from the king is scarcely more than a shadow. This brings up one of the few points of adverse criticism that can be made on the book. The author in his search for his hero's personality has been led to ascribe to Henry more general and far-reaching lines of policy than there is any warrant for believing he had. Henry seems to have been a specially laborious, practical, cold and direct man. To credit him with ultimate designs for a unification of Christendom, or with any definite "ideal of authority in church and state"; or to speak of him as "instinct with all the traditions of the past," or as "the champion of a lost cause," is to be misled by the requirements of the sub-title of the book.

With all respect to Dr. Stubbs, to whom this cognomen for Henry V. is due, and to Mr. Kingsford, who approves it, we cannot but feel that it is singularly ill-chosen. In the first place the expression "*mediæval*," as in some other places in the book, is somewhat of an anachronism when applied to a military commander who made use of cannon and of regularly paid volunteer soldiers in his campaigns, and to a ruler who obtained his income from taxes on exports, imports and personal property granted by a Parliament. It was just the things which were least medieval in fifteenth century England that Henry made use of most regularly. Moreover, the heroic impression made by Henry on his own and later times was almost entirely due to his military successes. He was not many-sided, like Edward I., for instance. His insistence on orthodoxy in religion was not unusual or striking. His sincere acceptance of existing constitutional limitations did not interest the contemporary man, however great the interest which it possesses for modern students. There was little that was medieval in Henry, and, except for the general mediocrity of his times, it would hardly have occurred to any one to elevate him to the position of a "hero," typical or otherwise.

Not that Henry V. was not a great man and an able ruler. Few men have had such uninterrupted success in what they have set their hands to do, and few have been so sorely missed when they dropped their work. This comes out clearly in Mr. Kingsford's narrative, which, notwithstanding his restricted space, discloses admirably the fine thoroughness of Henry's military and diplomatic preparations, and the steady accomplishment of his purposes.

We do not get much light on the old uncertainties of Henry's career, the extent of the excesses of his youth, his real reasons for renewing the French war, and his personal feelings toward Lollardry. But probably

there is no new light to be obtained on these from the existing material. Certainly the author has neglected none of this, and has not disregarded the problem. These besides were not the real matters of importance in Henry's career. Motives are less important historically than actions; and these Mr. Kingsford has given in a full, interesting and clear narrative. The book can be heartily praised, except that we should like to have seen the author refrain from giving to his subject a fanciful position as "the typical mediæval hero," and ascribe to him his true significance as a firm administrator of the old balanced English constitution of king and three estates, a brilliant leader of the nascent national feeling of England in the war against France, a conscientious king carrying out a clear if not very broad idea of his duty in that office.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

*Charles le Téméraire et la Ligue de Constance.* Par E. TOUTEY.  
(Paris: Hachette. 1902. Pp. 475.)

THE scope of M. Toutey's book is broader than its title. What lies nearest his heart is neither the fortunes of Charles of Burgundy nor those of the League of Constance, but the beginnings, a score of years before the French invasion of Italy, of a European balance of power and of international congresses; and what he has really given us is scarcely less than a diplomatic history of central Europe in the time of Charles the Bold. Yet a diplomatic history only. Of military history, save as incident to diplomacy, one learns little more than of society or institutions, of letters or of art. Even Grandson and Morat are despatched with less than a page apiece, and with a vagueness in striking contrast to the graphic narrative of a Delbrück or a Kirk.

Though it is now nearing two score years since John Foster Kirk gave to the press his *Charles the Bold*, the American's is still the one biography of the great Burgundian; but in the interval a multitude of special studies have thrown light upon one or another episode of his career, and scholars have unearthed not a few documents which escaped the patient search of his biographer. Of this newer literature, as of the older, M. Toutey has made a wide and thorough use attested not less by his text than by the half-dozen pages of his appended bibliography. Reassuring to the English reader is the respect he still shows to the book of Mr. Kirk; yet point of view and results could hardly be more antipodal. Nor can this be charged wholly to the anti-Burgundian sympathies natural to a French scholar; for his facile use of German sources and the excellent temper with which he can discuss an Alsace and Lorraine still imperial, show, on the whole, a rare absence of chauvinism. Nay, when he once slips as to the allegiance of a province, it is to aver (p. 200, note) that "la plus grande partie de la Flandre relevait de l'empire."

Hear, then, his estimate of Charles (p. 70, note):

"It is well known that his contemporaries called him Charles le Hardi until 1472, then Charles le Terrible after his campaign of Nesle, Beauvais, Rouen, and finally Charles le Téméraire in the last years of his life, 'when



he seems' says Comines, 'no longer to have had his understanding so clear.' In truth he was always ambitious, brutal, cruel (Dinant, Liège, Nesle), and little scrupulous in the choice of means (affairs of Péronne, of Guelders); but in the first part of his life he liked to parade political probity and chivalric sentiments, and in fact his treachery was not excessive for the age, his cruelty and his hate gratified themselves indeed only against his foes (the burghers of the towns, the King of France), or perhaps in cases where he had in view an evident advantage or where the victim to some extent deserved his fate (Louis XI., Adolf of Guelders). After 1473 his hate is yet more savage (Étienne de Hagenbach at Belfort, the garrison at Grandson), and his knavery is profitless. One could then believe that he did evil for evil's sake, as if out of a sort of vindictiveness toward mankind in general; it is, in fact, that he is avenging himself for having been deceived, not only by his enemies, like Louis XI., but by his friends (the Emperor at Treves, the King of England at Picquigny, Sigismund at Constance, etc.), and that, on the other hand, his schemes have so lifted him above the earth that he loses footing, that he is attacked by a veritable madness, *la folie des grandeurs*."

Nay, M. Toutey will not even grant him military genius. Despite his personal bravery and his skill as a drill-sergeant, "the truth is that he had the same military conceptions as his ancestor, King John the Good: to march against the foe and fight him face to face—*mais on n'en était plus là à la fin du 15<sup>e</sup> siècle*" (p. 324, note). Nor was he a statesman, but only an ambitious prince, haunted with memories of the Middle Ages, who still confused the idea of the state with that of property and believed that nation could be added to nation like field to field; while Louis of France, the Swiss cantons, the Alsatian towns, the Duke of Lorraine, "represent a principle essentially modern, that whereby every group of men having the same customs, the same aspirations, has a right to live and develop by itself, according to its own tastes and genius." Verily, this is to see them with modern eyes.

The book abounds in terse summaries and happy general views. Two maps and an appendix of documents add to its usefulness. Alas, the volume has no index.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*The Italian Renaissance in England. Studies.* By LEWIS EINSTEIN.  
[Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.]  
(New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Co., Agents. 1902. Pp. 420.)

THIS work is the latest issue in a series which includes a history of literary criticism in the Renaissance, together with volumes on the classical heritage of the Middle Ages and Spanish literature in the England of the Tudors. The present volume, like its predecessors, deals not with the technicalities of literary form, but with wider aspects of intellectual life and expression. The exact scope of the work is perhaps not at once apparent from the title, owing to the ambiguity of the term Renaissance.

In reality the work is an attempt to estimate the influence of Italy upon England along all lines, excepting the diplomatic and political, from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the death of Elizabeth. The justification for this attempt Mr. Einstein finds in the fact that, in spite of detached studies upon various phases of the subject, hitherto "no serious effort has been made to discover a common impulse running through the Italian influences in England: to find at the university, at court, and among the people at large, in different and even in opposite directions, the results of one and the same great movement."

In the development of his theme, the author traces three stages to the movement. The first was the purely scholarly and scientific stage, centering in the University of Oxford, and lasting until the end of the fifteenth century. The second stage was that in which Italian culture grew at court; it covers especially the first half of the sixteenth century. The third, covering the second half of the sixteenth century, saw the extension of the movement among the people at large, while at the same time there arose a national and puritanical reaction which ultimately put an end to the dominance of the Italian spirit. As is implied in the title, the volume is essentially a collection of studies. In Part I. these are entitled "The Scholar," "The Courtier," "The Traveller," and "The Italian Danger." Part II. contains brief accounts of the leading Italians in England in this period—churchmen, artists, diplomats, merchants, and others. Here are also included chapters on Italian political and historical ideas in England and the Italian influence in English poetry, while in an appendix is added an interesting account of English Catholics at Rome. The first part claims to concern itself chiefly "with the Englishman as affected by Italy . . . and later with the movement against Italian influence"; the second "treats rather of the Italians in England." As will be seen from the summary of contents above, this distinction is not altogether maintained, and influences and persons are dealt with more or less indiscriminately in both parts. Indeed, a certain lack of definition, a looseness of organization which causes confusion and needless repetition, is one of the faults of the book, betraying its origin in the researches of the industrious but unpracticed graduate student.

A large part of the book is made up, perhaps necessarily, of somewhat disjointed biographical fragments. In the chapter dealing with the Scholar, we start with Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, trace the influence of the individual Oxonians, Grey, Free, Flemming, Gunthorpe, and Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester—all students under or connected with Guarino Veronese—until the Renaissance movement is definitely established at Oxford by Grocyn, Linacre, and Latimer. Chapter II. deals largely with the courtesy books of Della Casas and Castiglione, which voiced and modified the social aspirations and ideals of the age. In every department of courtly life,—in manners, horsemanship, falconry, fencing, the etiquette of the duel, masks and music, etc.,—Italian influence is traced. Chapter VI., on the Italian merchant in England, con-

tains a summary of an interesting contract for the establishment of a mercantile and banking house in London, dated 1446. Cosimo de' Medici and Giovanni Benci are the parties of the first part, and their London agent or partner is of the second. Another document, taken like this one from the Florentine archives, contains instructions to guide the agent, and affords interesting glimpses into the methods of business and wide ramifications of the Italian banking houses.

In the main Mr. Einstein has succeeded in accomplishing what he undertook and has presented us with a useful summary of his subject. The book is provided with an index, some excellent illustrations in photogravure, and is comparatively free from errors of fact or print. A few slips, however, should be noted. The pope of the Renaissance was Paul II., not Paul I. (p. 23). The characterization of Rizzio as "prime minister of Scotland" (p. 76) is not altogether accurate. Finally the statement that Sebastian Cabot "commanded the first English ship to visit the West Indies and South America" (p. 278) would scarcely be made by any one conversant with the Cabot literature of the last twenty years.

SAMUEL B. HARDING.

*Mary Queen of Scots and Who Wrote the Casket Letters?* By

SAMUEL COWAN. (New York: James Pott and Co. 1901.

Two vols., pp. viii, 387; 407.)

THE strife which raged around Mary Stuart did not cease with her life; she lives on, an immortal subject of dispute between her ardent, uncompromising admirers and champions, and those who fail either to be dazzled by her brightness or to mistake tragic misfortune endured with marvelous spirit and steadfastness for snow-white innocence. Between the extremes of complete, unquestioning apology and of utter condemnation there is, however, ample room for sympathetic, though open-minded and unbiased discussion. For even those who approach the subject with the absolutely frank, honest and unfettered design to discover the truth will probably find it impossible to agree fully upon a solution of the more important historical riddles of her career. So that, when much remains really and honestly obscure and capable of various interpretation, it is scarcely wonderful that partizanship has run so high, considering that the question involves so much that appeals not only to British politics, patriotism, and religion, but to universal sympathies, which have naturally ever gone out to the almost incredibly tragic life of a beautiful, lovable, high-spirited, if guilty queen.

The latest knight to enter the lists against all who dare whisper aught against the Queen of Scots is Mr. Cowan, himself a Scotsman. His two handsome volumes are an uncompromising defense, a popular biography, based ostensibly upon a study of good historical materials both original and second-hand, but giving, it is to be feared, decided if not exclusive preference to evidence which tells in Mary's favor. In fact the book is hardly to be taken seriously as a real contribution to history,

though it is evidently intended as such. It is obviously a labor of love, the pious, enthusiastic work of a chivalrous, patriotic Scot, whose soul boils at the thought of the diabolical wrongs done the living Queen by her political enemies and to her memory by cold-blooded if not dishonest historians. The author's task has thus been not so much with laborious patience to inform himself if possible beyond his predecessors with a view to enlightened and authoritative judgment, as to place before his readers a narrative which, aided by passionate appeal for sympathy and noisy denunciation of slanderers, shall convert men to a set of Marian dogmas which he has apparently never been able or willing to regard for a moment as susceptible of honest doubt. In a word he is not a trained historian, not even a competent amateur. It is not to be expected that a task which taxed to the utmost the resources and trained faculties of a Mignet, should be creditably performed by so casual a writer.

If an author makes no pretense to be an impartial judge, he ought at least to prove himself a competent advocate. It is to be feared, however, that Mr. Cowan is neither the one nor the other. His is a book, not, as he evidently thinks and intends, suitable to rank with the scholarly defenses of Mary Stuart, but rather a book for that vague and presumably uncritical person, the general reader. But all this is merely saying that Mr. Cowan's is a bad book if judged from a strict historical standpoint, and scarcely calls for serious consideration in an historical review.

Still as the book is imposing in bulk and alluring in appearance, and as the author challenges the serious attention of critics by claiming to throw "new light on questions of great historical interest," it is but fair to give a few explicit reasons for our unfavorable judgment. First of all as the authorship of the Casket letters is so prominent on the title-page one would have expected that problem to occupy a considerable part of the book, as in Mr. Andrew Lang's recent acute and painstaking volume, which, by the way, gives the scholar such infinite relief and satisfaction after the inadequate, all too complacent work of his fellow-countryman. As a matter of fact Mr. Cowan has very little to say about the perhaps insoluble enigma of the letters, and that little is not very enlightening or convincing. It is amusing in this connection to contrast Mr. Cowan's cock-sure dictum that they are forgeries and "not the work of genius, but coarse incoherent pieces of composition" with Mr. Lang's modest and reverent judgment, that if the famous crucial Letter II. "be in part, at least, a forgery," it is "a forgery by a master in the science of human nature," and seemingly "beyond the power of the Genius of Forgery to produce." Mr. Cowan is not a good student of evidence. "Many of his criticisms," to use the words of that great Scottish authority, Dr. Hay Fleming, "are of the most puerile nature, and he has perfect faith in theories which have been long exploded." The same authority points out the textual inaccuracy of the many documents which Mr. Cowan has published, and notes that the original bond for Riccio's murder, which Mr. Cowan claims to have discovered and published for

the first time, was printed from the original with facsimiles of the signatures in 1843. It is needless to multiply instances.

The most valuable feature of Mr. Cowan's book is the series of sixteen portraits of Mary. One would like, however, to find critical notes on them, for, strictly speaking, portraits, to be useful historical material, should be studied and tested as relentlessly as written documents.

"The present work," says Mr. Cowan in his preface, "is not free from faults and blemishes, for no work on this subject can be so on account of the imperfect nature of the material we have to draw upon." In this estimate of his book no critic will venture to differ from Mr. Cowan, but we are inclined to think that there are faults and blemishes for which no imperfections of material can account.

W. F. TILTON.

*History of Scotland.* By P. HUME BROWN. Vol. II. From the Accession of Mary Stewart to the Revolution of 1689. (Cambridge: University Press. 1902. Pp. xiv, 464.)

THE notes of the Scottish Reformation are unanimity and idealism. The awakening of a national conscience was naturally followed by grave political results. But the peculiarity of the movement in Scotland was the profound conviction with which the majority of the nation accepted Calvinism and the devoted idealism of their attempt to put that system into practice.

The Treaty of Edinburgh assured the ultimate success of the new religion. The reformers broke the ancient alliance with France and turned to England whose help had enabled them to win out in their long struggle. Mary Stuart's attempt to maintain the two religions side by side failed. But the conflagration in which this failure involved Scotland, by removing the Queen, gave time and space for the diffusion of the new thought. Knox and Melville, Moray and Morton working in various spirits and for various ends organized the Kirk. And this Kirk was a new thing with its own constitution and its own infallible sanction, rooted in the unhesitating assent of a reflecting and intelligent people over whose life it exercised a strenuous supervision. This body confronted James Stuart when, in 1578, he began to govern the nation of which he conceived himself to be the divinely appointed ruler. It was no empty boast of Melville's that in Scotland there were two kings and two kingdoms.

James's religious convictions as well as his political ambition of uniting England and Scotland moved him so to remodel the Kirk as to allow of its being incorporated into the English establishment. Once master of the endowment of the ancient church he was able to promote his ends by playing on the cupidity of the nobles and the necessities of the reformed clergy. By 1612 he had established a modified form of episcopacy. The next move, the readjustment of rite and doctrine contained in the Five Articles of Perth, was made by "a dead lift of royal

power." Charles I. undertook to go further and precipitated<sup>1</sup> the storm that had gathered over his father's head. From the first Bishop's War until the Restoration the Calvinism of Calvin prevailed in Scotland.

But other forces were at work. The Scots were a loyal as well as a religious people. They feared God and honored the king, and if they found predestination in their Bibles they found royalty there as well. There was, too, an irreconcilable antinomy between the Kirk as shaped by Knox and Melville on the Geneva pattern and the Stuart conception of royalty. Each was a receptacle of infallibility; to accommodate its life to either might have been thought task enough for any nation. Though the Scots, up to 1612 and again at the Restoration, were willing to sacrifice to their loyalty something of the disciplinary side of Calvinism, this one concession did not suffice to resolve the antinomy. But the idea of toleration was at work, strengthened on the one hand by individualism, on the other by indifference, and Scotland took back the uncovenanted Stuarts and abandoned the Cameronians.

The nation was preoccupied with politics rather than theology, when in 1688 the birth of a Roman Catholic heir to their Roman Catholic king presented them with a problem involving both of those interests. The idea of constitutional monarchy furnished a solution and Scotland was for the moment at rest under two sovereigns who, although of Stuart blood, had repudiated in terms the Stuart conception of royalty.

The present volume suggests to the student of the comparative history of institutions an interesting line of speculation. What, namely, might have been the fate of royalty in Scotland had not the two crowns been united. The feudalism of the Middle Ages was immediately succeeded by the Kirk of the Reformation. What could the Kirk have made of a king (God's silly vassal indeed) unsupported by another kingdom and another crown?

Professor Hume Brown has done his work well. He has dealt with a big subject in a little book which turns out to be at once readable and scholarly. His detachment is exemplary; like Knox, he can face Mary Stuart unmoved. His judgments of her (p. 116) and of Montrose (pp. 335-336) are admirable for justice and temperance. He throws more light on the intrigue of Lennox with the Roman Catholics in 1581 (p. 183) and on the details of the Cromwellian Union (pp. 365 ff.), and argues (pp. 340 ff.) that the Scots army did not sell Charles but surrendered him because, in the face of his refusal to take the covenant, no other course was possible. In his account of the Battle of Dunbar he follows Firth as against Carlyle and Gardiner. But when he speaks of "the feudal instinct for a sovereign lord" (p. 342) one must register a protest. It has been well argued that the logic of feudalism did not require a king at all, it did not surely admit of any sovereignty in the office.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

<sup>1</sup> Professor Hume Brown relegates Jenny Geddes and her stool to the limbo of tradition (p. 301 n.) where, even by historical scholars, she will not soon be forgotten.



*The History of the Jesuits in England, 1580-1773.* By ETHEL-RED L. TAUNTON. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.; London: Methuen and Co. 1901. Pp. xii, 513.)

THIS work purports to trace the history of the Jesuits in England from the advent of Parsons and Campion to the suppression of the society by Clement XIV. In reality, however, it is mainly an estimate of the character, work and influence of Robert Parsons, an undertaking which claims nearly four-fifths of the entire book. From the author's point of view this division may be justifiable, since he regards Parsons not only as the greatest of the English Jesuits but also as the founder of the policy which dominated them throughout the period. Nevertheless, one regrets to see a single phase of the subject treated so exhaustively while the remainder is disposed of in mere bold outlines. Father Taunton's estimate of the aims of the society and of the means by which it sought to realize them is severe and searching. "The Jesuits as a body," he says, "stood for the Catholic Reaction, from first to last, a political expedient. The clergy, on the other hand, contented themselves with the cause of Religion." He has little confidence in the historians of their body, More, Foley, Constable, and Plowden, "to say nothing of Jouveney, Tanner, and Bartoli," and he remarks of Foley in particular, that he has "found him, at a critical point, quietly leaving out, without any signs of omission, an essential part of a document which was averse to his case." As to results: "Parsons and his followers only succeeded in achieving a brilliant failure," though "they were acute enough to snatch the credit of Campion, Southwell, Thomas Garnett, and others who did the better and more fitting work," and "were the true heroes of the Society in England." Heavy charges are brought against Parsons. He is accused of plotting against Elizabeth's crown, against the succession of James VI., of founding seminaries abroad solely in the Jesuit interest, of having spies everywhere—in England, Spain, Flanders, Italy, and possibly in France. His aim was not only to regain England for Rome but to establish the supremacy of the Jesuits: a purpose which he sought to effect not by "the patient toil and blood of missionaries" but by intrigue and the armed intervention of Spain.

The attitude toward Henry Garnett and the other Jesuits alleged to have been connected with the Gunpowder Plot is equally condemnatory. In studying the evidence on this subject Father Taunton states that he has had to find his "way through a labyrinth of falsehood and contradictions on all sides," though he has nothing but praise for Gardiner's masterly work. His conclusion is that the accused Jesuits, though not actually instigators of the plot, were "mixed up in treasonable practices" with the conspirators. Garnett himself, though merely the instrument of those above him, had been privy to a plan as early as 1601 to induce the King of Spain to send another invasion to England, he knew all the particulars of the Gunpowder Plot before July 25, 1605, and was "in no sense of the word . . . a martyr for his religion nor a martyr for the

seal of confession." Here as elsewhere the author is anxious to show that the great body of English Roman Catholics were not guilty of either privacy or sympathy with the machinations of the Jesuits.

The remainder of the book calls for little comment. Except in one or two places the story from this point dwindles into a meager chronicle. Regarding the position and influence of Father Petre, evidence is cited to show that James II. was a mere tool in his hands, while the Jesuit father himself was the scape-goat of others—*i. e.*, of the General, the Provincial, and the Confessor of the society. However, one would think that a safer guide might have been chosen for the characterization of Father Petre than Macaulay. It is interesting to note that Father Taunton goes so far as to attribute the fall of the Stuarts to the influence of Parsons and the society.

Certain statements made by the writer might be questioned. For example, Gardiner has shown that James I. never knowingly signed the letter to the Pope requesting that the Scotch bishop of Vazion be made a cardinal; again one would like the authority for the assertion that the King had no intention of "carrying out" the Spanish marriage. Later Charles II. is unjustly blamed for the failure to carry out the provisions of the Treaty of Breda with regard to liberty of conscience. Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftsbury, was perhaps the "chief and leader of the anti-Catholic party," yet it is hardly true to say that it was under his auspices that the Popish Plot was formed.

The dignity of the author's style is marred by an occasional colloquialism. In general, though the work contains much information, it can scarcely be regarded as a complete and well-proportioned history of the whole subject. The index, though long and full, is lacking in one or two important points. There is an appendix containing extracts from the writings of Parsons.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Russian Political Institutions.* By MAXIME KOVALEVSKY. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1902. Pp. ix, 299.)

*A History of Russia from the Birth of Peter the Great to Nicholas II.* By W. R. MORFILL. (New York: James Pott and Co. 1901. Pp. viii, 486.)

HOWEVER much the above two works may differ in other respects, they have at least one trait in common — they are both difficult reading. For Professor Kovalevsky we must make allowances. The lectures which he delivered last year at the University of Chicago, and which are here reproduced, should be judged with the leniency due any man writing in a language not his own. It is, therefore, needless to insist on the faults of his style, even when he goes so far as to use the phrase "meddled with" when he means intermixed with; and, by a stretch of charity, it is also possible to ascribe a number of pretty loose historical statements to his incomplete mastery of English phrase. Still, no indulgence can absolve him from the charge of having overloaded his lectures with a

confused mass of detail, much of which could hardly be comprehensible without considerable previous knowledge on the part of his hearers or readers. It is all obviously unsuited to the average American public. Even less pardonable, because quite evitable, is the only too evident fact that, if Professor Kovalevsky has not a perfect acquaintance with English, his proof-reader must have been utterly ignorant of Russian. The glaring, absurd mistakes in the Russian words used are innumerable; and as there is also more than one misprinted date, the total effect is very slovenly. Surely, it would have been possible to find somebody in Chicago who could have remedied this, and have saved the credit of a press that is a recognized part of a well-known university. What can one say, too, to the sending to "the Literary Editor" of three ready-made notices which "may be of value in connection with your review columns"?

However, after disregarding all defects of form and accompaniment, we can admit that the substance of Professor Kovalevsky's work is of serious value. He writes with knowledge and authority, even if carelessly. His familiarity with the broader fields of law and economics has been of service in fitting him for the task of interpreting to foreigners the institutions of his native land. His bias is by no means ultra-national; indeed, in his last two chapters, those on Poland and Finland, he does not even present fairly the Russian side of the case. His general standpoint is that of an admirer of parliamentary institutions, as we are warned by his preface, where he says that he has "no doubt that the difficulties which Russia has to undergo, and which arise from her present internal conditions, have no other cause than the interruption of the evolution already begun in favor of a constitutional monarchy. The only loser in this case will be, of course, bureaucracy." This is sweeping enough to show us that we must not look for a perfectly objective treatment of his theme on the part of the writer. His topic is well worth study. Russian institutions and their development are little known to the western public, and it is by no means easy to get at reliable information about them. Despite the many features in them that have been borrowed from the outside, they have a strong national element, and they deserve much more serious attention than they have received in other countries. We have here an attempt to fill a gap, so that even if there still remains plenty of room we can be grateful for what we have got. It is to be regretted that, owing presumably to carelessness, the author has not escaped some pretty serious errors of detail — for instance, in spite of fresh information, the question as to the identity of "the false Demetrius" seems as far as ever from being settled, and he probably was not "a certain Grishka Otrepiev" (p. 56). The Juriev represented at the Sobor of Michael Romanov in 1642 evidently could not be "the modern Dorpat," then in the hands of Sweden, but was Juriev-Polski, in the present government of Vladimir. It is not true that the Tsarevich Alexis was "executed by the orders of his own father, Peter the Great" (p. 110). He was condemned by the court which Peter had instituted, and the

sentence was confirmed ; but the prince died before it could be carried out, thus leaving a possibility of doubt whether it ever would have been. On the next page we read that Elizabeth "was a bastard, for there was nothing to prove a marriage between Peter the Great and Catherine." Peter publicly married Catherine in 1712, after the campaign of the Pruth. The attacks on the legitimacy of their daughters were due to the fact that both of them were born before this marriage, and that Peter's first wife was still alive. The reference to the murder of Ivan VI. (p. 124) is unpardonably wrong. Mirovich was not "the man who perpetrated it," but, on the contrary, was trying to free the captive, who was put to death by his keepers to prevent the rescue. Finally, Alexander I. was the grandson, not "the great-grandson" (p. 286), of Catherine II. These are not the only errors, but when all is said, one can read Professor Kovalevsky's book with a good deal of profit.

The same remark can hardly hold true of Mr. Morfill's last work. He has written for "the general reader," but it is hard to imagine anything more confusing to such a reader than his jumble of names and facts, and his sudden digressions and sub-digressions in every possible direction. The garrulousness of his style is at times absolutely bewildering. Although he may have, as he says, mostly drawn from Russian sources, and have freely availed himself of the material furnished, not only by the leading historians of the country, but also of what is contained in the historical reviews and the transactions of Russian learned societies, it profits us but little: his narrative consists often of hardly more than a string of disconnected anecdotes. There is no sense of proportion. For instance, though it may be worth while to devote over fifty pages to Napoleon's Moscow campaign, especially as this is the best written part of the book, still, all the subsequent events in the reign of Alexander I., such as the campaigns in Germany and France, the Congress of Vienna, the Holy Alliance and the reactionary policy of the last years, deserve more than a total of fifteen. And yet this is a trifle compared with the fact that in a history of modern Russia an event of the most transcendent importance, which has been called perhaps the greatest legislative act in the history of mankind, the emancipation of the forty million serfs by Alexander II., is disposed of in a page and a half, much less than is squandered away on many a superfluous anecdote.

After this it is hard to treat the work seriously, as it rambles on, from one subject to another. The beginning is characteristic. We get to an anecdote in the third line, and in the preamble thereof we meet the extraordinary pronouncement that "Alexis was perhaps the first Tsar who had what would now be called a foreign policy." Typical of Mr. Morfill's looseness is his calling Maria Theresa indiscriminately "the German Empress" and "the Austrian Empress," both terms open to criticism. As for his general views, one notes that he carries his partizanship of Peter the Great to the point of glossing over the terrible story of the Tsarevich Alexis ; that he does not do justice to the statesmanship of Bestuzhev, the minister of the Empress Elizabeth ; that in dealing with

Peter III. and Catherine II. he attaches, characteristically enough, too much importance to the untrustworthy gossip of Rulhière ; that he has a rhetorical aversion to the Turks, and gives a false idea of the respective strength of the opposing fleets at the Battle of Navarino ; that his attitude towards "the great emperor" Nicholas I. is in the main sympathetic, while his tone toward the French in the Crimean War is throughout fault-finding and unfair. He abounds in loose and hazardous statements, but it is needless here to point out his errors of detail, some of which are, doubtless, mere slips. For the "general reader" the book contains not a little useful information if he can succeed in extracting and remembering it. Mr. Morfill has a wide knowledge of Slavic history and languages, and a kindly personality shines through his pages, but oh ! how could an Oxford professor use the word "researcher" ?

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

*The Development of Cabinet Government in England.* By MARY TAYLOR BLAUVELT, M.A. (New York : The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xvi, 300.)

IN this volume the author shows the historical origin of the English Cabinet and traces the successive steps in its development. The discussion begins with the differentiation of the Cabinet from the Privy Council and ends with the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria. The author has done her work well and has made a valuable contribution to historical and political literature. The importance of the subject can scarcely be overestimated. The Cabinet is the most important feature of the English government. It sways and guides the House of Commons, which is the real governing power in England ; and its history has never before been presented in monographic form. Traill, Todd, Anson and others have given us brief sketches of the development of special phases of the Cabinet but the subject has never before been treated in a connected and detailed way. This has been well done in the volume now under discussion, and the book has, therefore, a distinct place in the literature of the subject.

The author's task has not been an easy one. The development of the Cabinet has extended over a long period of time, hence it was necessary to work over an immense amount of historical material. This appears to have been conscientiously done as the author, for the most part, has consulted the original sources. Some readers will regret that the author did not see fit to bring the discussion down to a somewhat later period. The book practically closes with the accession of Queen Victoria, and there are some interesting phases of Cabinet development in the reign of the late Queen which might well be made the subject of an additional chapter. Such a continuation would add force and a degree of completeness to the volume which it now lacks. In fact the concluding pages of the book are weak because of too great condensation.

While the book is a good substantial piece of work, it might be improved in some respects. It does not show so great a degree of familiarity with the actual practice of the English government as might be desired. The printed sources have been studied with great care but there is much information concerning the actual working of the government which is "in the air" and not in books or documents. This phase has not been developed as fully as it might be. An illustration will serve to make my meaning clear. On page 2 the author remarks: "He [the Prime Minister] is appointed nominally by the Crown, but where the ruling party has a distinctly recognized leader, the Crown has no choice but to appoint this leader. When there is no such preëminent leadership, the Crown may choose from among the two or three most prominent members of the party." This is the usual way of putting it, but the latter part of the statement is somewhat misleading. It is no longer true that "when there is no such preëminent leadership, the Crown may choose from among the two or three most prominent members of the party." The Crown has practically no choice even in such a case as this. The appointment of Lord Rosebery in 1894 is a case in point. When Mr. Gladstone resigned the premiership in that year there was no "recognized leader" in the liberal party besides himself. It might seem then that Queen Victoria would have been free to choose the Premier from the "two or three most prominent members of the party" then in power. This was not true, however. Lord Rosebery and Sir William Vernon-Harcourt were the two most conspicuous men in the Liberal party at the time, aside from Mr. Gladstone. Both of these men had been prominently mentioned in connection with the premiership, but the choice was not left to the Queen. A conference of Liberal leaders decided to recommend the appointment of Lord Rosebery, and he was accordingly chosen. No one expected that the Queen would disregard the wishes of the party leaders. No one now supposes that King Edward exercised his free choice in the appointment of Mr. Balfour. There was no alternative. Had he preferred Joseph Chamberlain he would not have been able to elevate him to the premiership against the wishes of the leaders of the Conservative party. It is now safe to say that the appointment of the Premier is, in practice, dictated by the party leaders, and that the Crown exercises no discretion in the matter whatever. It should be said, however, that in the neglect of the practical side of the subject our author has not erred more grievously than the larger majority of those who discuss the English government. The older writers following Blackstone and tradition, have elaborated the theory and ignored the practice. A few later writers, following the refreshing example of Bagehot, have ventured to show that the practice does not always coincide with the theory.

The book is not as satisfactory from the standpoint of good English as it is from that of historical excellence. It cannot be said to be well written. The book lacks definiteness and precision of statement throughout, and not infrequently the construction of its sentences is decidedly



faulty. However, the above defects are by no means vital, and the volume is, on the whole, a worthy one. T. F. MORAN.

*The Scotch-Irish, or the Scot in North Britain, North Ireland, and North America.* By CHARLES A. HANNA. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Two vols., pp. ix, 623; 602.)

THERE is a story of a certain sick judge who instructed his daughter when reading books to him to read only the quotations. She would have had much to read if she were dealing with Mr. Hanna's volumes. In truth they are mostly all quotations. No one can deny that as a result much varied information is imparted, but what we have is not a history, as the title implies, not even well arranged materials for a history, but a collection of materials, much irrelevant, which might be worked up into a history of the Scotch-Irish. It seems a pity that Mr. Hanna has not done this working up himself, but he has not even attempted it, nay he frankly avows that "these volumes are designed to serve as an introduction to a series of Historical Collections" "relating to the early Scotch-Irish settlements in America," and so we are as far away as ever from what is really a desideratum, a history of the Scotch-Irish.

Let us now see what Mr. Hanna has given us. Volume I. contains very sketchy and far from exhaustive chapters upon the Scotch-Irish and the Revolution, the Scotch-Irish and the Constitution, and other themes connected with their early history in this country, with a view to show that by all odds they were the most important factor in the formation of the republic. Much of the proof consists in naming the nationality or ancestry of the prominent men in the early American days, which reveals that they were Scotch-Irish in a surprising proportion of cases. The notes to these chapters are valuable because of their quotations and references. With the eighth chapter, Mr. Hanna begins a new cycle. He now abandons the Scotch-Irish in America to their fate and for thirty-one chapters leads us through Scottish, English and Irish history. Premising that we are entirely ignorant of all knowledge of the history of those countries he presents us with hundreds of pages of excerpts from the sources and from standard historians. True, some of the material thus brought together is inaccessible and all of it is in itself valuable, but it seems a pity that so much should have little to do with the declared object of the volumes. We could have spared the space given to Scots and Picts, Norse and Angles and such like. We fear few will read the excerpts from the English Chronicles. We then get down to the Great Ulster Plantation and the Emigration thence to America.

Volume II. has only five chapters. "The American Union" (5 pp.) showing it was a Simon-pure Presbyterian product, "Seventeenth Century Emigration from Scotland and Ulster," in which Theodore Roosevelt is claimed for Presbyterianism (!); "The Seaboard Colonies"; "Pennsylvania," "The Settlements Enumerated." Then follow the "Appendixes," excerpt matter upon the themes treated in the previous part of the volumes; a "Scotch-Irish Bibliography,"

which is not so good as it might be because not upon a good plan: it combines a subject, author and title catalogue, arranged under the rubrics, countries, states and counties, but the plan is not carried out uniformly; and an index, which though very elaborate is mostly of names, and unfortunately not inclusive of all the names, for at the bottom of each page of the index we read: "For additional names see references on page 553 of this volume."

The Volume I. is prefaced by a map of Scotland, which has no special place. One of Ulster, Ireland, would have been more acceptable; to Volume II. is prefaced a specially drawn map of the thirteen colonies with the centers of Scotch-Irish settlement marked upon it. These centers are 123 in number and are particularly thick in North and South Carolina. This special map deserves warm commendation. It is a real contribution to the subject. It may be said also that the mechanical appearance of the volumes reflects great credit upon the Knickerbocker Press.

There surely is a welcome awaiting a history of the Scotch-Irish. We wish Mr. Hanna would give it to us. He can come measurably near it and serve the cause he has at heart if he is willing to rearrange the contents of the two volumes he has given us so as to put together his chapters upon the Scotch-Irish in chronological order and with omission of the irrelevant matter. He might throw into less space the valuable lists of the original Scotch-Irish and their descendants in America, revise his bibliography so as to make it consistent and even fuller, and arrange his index so as to take in all the names and also so as to be more analytical. He can thus reduce his two volumes to one, relieve himself of the suspicion of having emptied a huge scrap-book upon the unsuspecting public, and increase the number of his readers. Such a volume will then be a fitting introduction to the historical collections he promises us and which we shall be very glad to receive. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

*The Diamond Necklace*, Being the True Story of Marie Antoinette and the Cardinal de Rohan. From the new Documents recently discovered in Paris. By FRANTZ FUNCK-BRENTANO. Authorized Translation by H. SUTHERLAND EDWARDS. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1901. Pp. 350.)

*La Mort de la Reine. (Les Suites de l'Affaire du Collier.)* D'Après de Nouveaux Documents recueillis en partie par A. Bégis. By FRANTZ FUNCK-BRENTANO. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1902. Pp. 262.)

It is a pleasure to find another Revolutionary episode rescued from the domain of Carlylean declamation and presented to us with a vividness equal to that of the Sage of Chelsea, with wider research, juster criticism and without the homilies. The author of these books is a skilled historical student with no disturbing preoccupations, who has already proven himself a past-master in the art of tracing the intricate

and deceptive windings and turnings of great crimes and conspiracies. In the two books before us we have a very detailed and carefully authenticated history of the most famous case of the eighteenth century, which Mirabeau called the "prelude of the Revolution" and which was so fateful for all the participants voluntary and involuntary. After the labors of M. Funck "this poor opaque intrigue of the Diamond Necklace" may be considered to have attained a clear and authoritative description. Not only has the author been content with narrating this history in its main lines but he has gone elaborately into the minutiae of the case, has traced the careers of the secondary persons involved, with care and fidelity and has thrown new light upon some of the conditions prevailing in the France of the Old Régime.

He has searched a large mass of material, the National Archives, the archives of the city of Paris, of the Bastille (a field which he has previously made his own), and of the Arsenal, besides the memoirs, judicial pieces, newspapers and pamphlets of the time. With this merit of exhaustive investigation M. Funck unites literary talents of a high order, a style vigorous, compact, full of color, an exceptional analytical quality, an artist's ability of arrangement and co-ordination. His narrative indeed has much of the brilliancy and precision of the ill-starred necklace which is its central theme.

He presents us with a series of portraits drawn with delicacy and vivacity,—for instance that of Cardinal de Rohan, tall and lithe in figure, proclaiming in every movement the nobility of his race, an "aristocratic product such as the most refined civilizations produce in their most delicate developments," a man of "much heart and much wit, with a subtle elegance, whose singular charm was heightened by his dignity as an ecclesiastic," moving easily and with honor among the Immortals of the French Academy, by whom he was received at the age of twenty-seven, a man whose great fortune allowed him to do good on a large scale, which he did, "graciously and in a genial spirit," living with magnificence the worldly life, no crabbed censor of the peccadilloes of frail men and women, in short, a man to charm and win. Yet this polished, sceptical, satirical, worldly prelate was an ardent follower of Cagliostro, whom he luxuriously housed for long periods of time and was to be the easy and pitiable dupe of Madame de la Motte. "The great difficulty in the strange story of the Necklace," says M. Funck, "is the excessive credulity attributed to the Cardinal. But here are precise documents agreeing with one another which prove that the Cardinal was incredibly credulous. Two days before he was arrested, Cagliostro persuaded him that he had dined with Henry IV." The portraiture of Maria Theresa, of Marie Antionette, of the Countess de Polignac, of Jeanne de Valois, of Cagliostro, Boehmer and Bassange, Nicole d'Oliva, Bette d'Etienneville and the wonderful Baron de Fages are equally well executed.

The author shows the origin of the animosity felt by Maria Theresa against the Prince de Rohan,—an animosity dating from that person's em-

bassy to Vienna, that "horrid shameful embassy" as she called it,—and holds an initial and exceedingly grave error of that monarch to have been her insistence that Marie Antoinette share in all its vehemence her own intense dislike, and also her constant endeavor to use her daughter to reinforce her own Austrian policy.

M. Funck's narrative abounds in dramatic incidents, brilliantly told,—the opening chapter where the Cardinal Coadjutor, young Prince de Rohan, receives in the cathedral of Strassburg the young Princess Marie Antoinette, coming from Vienna to Paris to be Dauphiness and Queen,—the early life of Jeanne de Valois, with its fierce restlessness and envy—and that tremendous moment when on the day of Assumption, before all the court of Versailles, the Prince-Cardinal, Grand Almoner of France, arrayed in his pontifical garments, prepared for divine service, is arrested like a thief.

This arrest, in the opinion of the author, was an irreparable fault, a mistake than which none could be more grievous. The King and Queen, on first hearing the story that implicated the latter, took the conduct of the affair, which they did not in the slightest degree understand and were not competent to fathom or appreciate, into their own hands. "The affair", writes the Queen to her brother Joseph II., "has been concerted between the King and myself. The ministers know nothing of it." Most unfortunately, says M. Funck, for the Queen was actuated not by wisdom or understanding, but by indignation, by intense antipathy to the Cardinal inspired by her mother and now revived in all its force, whereas, if the matter had first been referred to the ministry, there was one man in it of profound knowledge of men and things, who would have insisted that action be postponed until some light had been thrown upon the intrigue, who would have appreciated the political significance of the humiliating arrest of so notable a seigneur and prelate upon mere suspicion, who probably would have prevented the terrible blunder. A second blunder no less disastrous, was Louis XVI.'s action in handing the case to the Parliament, for trial,—a body whose first desire was not justice, but the humiliation of the crown and the overthrow of the arbitrary power of ministers. The trial throws a sharp light upon the nature of "absolute" monarchy in France in the eighteenth century (pp. 327-328).

In his second volume, *La Mort de la Reine*, a continuation of the *Diamond Necklace*, M. Funck traces the later careers of those implicated in the Necklace affair, the Queen, the Cardinal, Cagliostro, the Countess de la Motte, a fugitive in London, trading in her infamy, writing mendacious memoirs, assisted in so doing, it seems clear, by Calonne, frequently supposed to be the Queen's favorite minister but really one of her most venomous and most persistent enemies, the Count de la Motte, living till 1830 and practising intermittently the gentle art of blackmail, part of the time receiving a pension from the restored Bourbons.

The translation of the *Diamond Necklace* by H. Sutherland Edwards is accurate and spirited. Neither book possesses an index.

CHARLES D. HAZEN.

*The History of the Louisiana Purchase.* By JAMES K. HOSMER.  
(New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1902. Pp. xv, 230.)

THIS story of our first expansion, attractively bound and neatly printed, is divided into eleven chapters. The first gives a running history of the country up to the time of its transfer to Spain in 1762. The second chapter deals with Louisiana under Spain, and the next with the work of Toussaint in San Domingo, so important in thwarting Napoleon's colonial designs, the negotiations of Napoleon with Spain, and the first movement of Jefferson toward purchase. Chapters IV.-VI. are devoted to further events in America and Europe which spurred the Americans to buy and Napoleon to sell the bone of contention. Two of these chapters deal with the quarrel of Napoleon with his two brothers, Joseph and Lucien, because of their opposition to the sale, the details of which, largely based on Lucien's memoirs, are given at some length, including the famous bath-room scene. The two next chapters take up Livingston and Monroe at Paris and the conclusion of the treaty of purchase. Herein, together with the two preceding chapters, the author makes much of his belief, expressed in the preface, that "the transaction was a piece of Napoleonic statesmanship, Jefferson and his negotiators playing only a secondary part." Yet Dr. Hosmer takes care to point out that Livingston foresaw that the relinquishment of the whole territory was inevitable. Chapter IX. treats of the constitutional questions involved in the purchase as discussed in Congress, and the violent opposition of the Federalists. The next chapter gives a dramatic account of the formal transfer of sovereignty at New Orleans, and the last recites the salient points in the history of the Louisiana territory to the present day. Three appendices contain Livingston's memorial of February 1, 1803, giving reasons why France should sell Louisiana, Napoleon's order for the sale, and the treaties of session and payment.

The book under review is timely in a twofold way, appearing when we are about to celebrate the centenary of our first expansion and when the question of expansion itself still lingers in the public mind. Though written for "youths on the verge of maturity and men and women too busy for a deep study of the matter," the book is both readable and scholarly. While acknowledging his indebtedness to his predecessors, the author claims to have made a new presentation of the subject. He has brought into the compass of about forty thousand words a most interesting story, but, in spite of the use of original sources, largely French, and although he gives "at length some important secret history not heretofore fully set forth in English," his addition to our stock of knowledge on the subject is rather small, and it must be said that some of the additions are questionable. One who has read the correspondence of our various representatives at Madrid will be surprised to learn that "the Spanish attitude to the United States was, in fact, most friendly, though little appreciated then or since" (p. 35). If Dr. Hosmer has discovered that the "favorable disposition of the King," so often held out to our min-

isters but never put into deeds, was real, it is due to history that the proof be forthcoming. If "it was not easy for Madison to feel that this free navigation of the Mississippi was so very important" (p. 63), why did he express his amazement to Monroe that the thought of surrendering it should even be entertained,<sup>1</sup> or why did he return to Congress (1786) mainly to defeat Jay's proposed treaty surrendering this right?<sup>2</sup> The statement that "the Spanish officials had withdrawn with all the stately circumstance that had surrounded them," probably refers only to their withdrawal from office, but is likely to mislead, since they lingered in Louisiana and fomented much trouble until finally ordered away. The author's treatment of Jefferson is similar to that of Mr. Henry Adams, whom he has read with care, though a little more favorable.

DAVID Y. THOMAS.

*The Sectional Struggle.* An Account of the Troubles Between the North and the South, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Civil War. First Period Ending with the Compromise of 1833. Part concerning the Early Tariffs and Nullification. By CICERO W. HARRIS. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lipincott Co. 1902. Pp. 343.)

THE author of this work thinks that "the time has come when the more thoughtful people of both sections are ready to receive a full-length view of the long political and constitutional struggle between the North and the South." He has accordingly "devoted his spare time" to constructing such a work "from original sources . . . with infinite . . . care as to data and great catholicity in the handling of vexed questions." As announced in the title, the plan covers the entire field of sectionalism, but the author, for reasons not apparent, has seen fit to publish a part only, which has a decidedly fragmentary character. As it stands it is not a monograph dealing with the early tariff controversy, but a number of chapters from a larger work, whose unity is to be found only in the fact that they deal with struggles involving sectional feeling.

The scope of the work is narrow, being confined practically to tariff discussion in Congress. Four-fifths of the book is taken up with abstracts of debates, the rest being devoted to extremely brief statements of political events. Nothing is said about the economic conditions which caused the tariff controversy except in so far as these are referred to in southern speeches, and while the contents of every bill and amendment are given, there is nothing done by the author to explain the rates proposed or adopted. Even when votes are recorded no attempt is made to analyze them, nor is it shown in most cases to what extent sectionalism influenced the result. Political parties are seldom mentioned. In its very limited range the work seems to have been carefully and systematically carried out, being based apparently upon the *Annals of Congress* and Niles's *Register*. It is perhaps most useful in the chapters where

<sup>1</sup> June 26, 1786.

<sup>2</sup> Gay's *Madison*, 81 ff.



the nullification debates of 1830 and 1833 are summarized. Here the legal problems of constitutional interpretation are handled with a freedom not elsewhere observed.

In the brief narrative paragraphs no mistakes of any consequence have been noted, but there is nothing original in them, nor indeed is there in the whole book, unless it be a certain unusual freedom from sectional bias on the author's part. He differs from nearly all his predecessors and contemporaries, northern and southern, in condemning no one for his opinions. On the contrary he bestows praise upon all, reserving his nearest approaches to severity for Webster, Clay and Calhoun. In fact, this uniform laudation gives the work a curiously old-fashioned, high-polite air, which persists in spite of the presence of occasional words like "brainiest." No one of the political worthies of those days fails to receive due salutation. The membership of every Congress, convention or legislature is "eminent," "distinguished," or "illustrious"; speeches are invariably "logical and ingenious," "learned and argumentative," "notable," "subtle," "long and luminous," "elegant and impassioned," "powerful," or "tremendous." Yet if the book is to be welcomed for any one feature it is for holding such an appreciative attitude toward Lowndes, Hayne, McDuffie, Forsyth, Mallary, Cambrelong, Lawrence and others who, as the author says in the preface, "have seldom received their dues from historians." The men who did the real work in the earlier Congresses are by no means always those whose names appear most frequently in the pages of later writers. This feature apart, the book is in reality not so much history as a digest or summary of part of the material for the history of the tariff controversy.

T. C. SMITH.

*The Life of Charles Robinson, the First State Governor of Kansas.*

By FRANK W. BLACKMAR. (Topeka, Kansas: Crane and Co. 1902. Pp. 438.)

THE controversies over the early history of Kansas have revolved mainly about three men — John Brown, General Lane and Governor Robinson. The biographers of Brown were early in the field, Redpath being the pioneer among them with his sensational book published in 1860. Though newspaper sketches, like the rather interesting screeds of "Kicking-Bird," in *The Kansas City Times*, were not wanting, no formal life of Lane appeared until 1896, while that of Robinson was delayed until 1902.

Perhaps it would be hazardous to say that these Kansas controversies have been practically settled by the investigations and discussions of the last two decades, but certain points seem to be fairly established. It is evident that John Brown, who went to Kansas for the avowed purpose of fomenting the disturbances and precipitating a collision between the North and South, hindered the free-state movement in the territory, quite as much as he helped it; that Lane, with all his brilliant and attractive qualities, was rash and unscrupulous, and that Robinson repre-

sented the more conservative type among the Northern settlers—the men who would fight if attacked, but proposed to settle the territorial difficulties at the polls and finally carried their point.

Professor Blackmar's book appears, then, after the fierceness of the old controversies has abated, though the crude blackguardism which was often a conspicuous characteristic of them is not yet wholly extinct. This work certainly ought not to revive the quiescent feuds, as it is notably moderate and judicial in temper. The writer has endeavored, and with a good degree of success, to render to all the Cæsars what belongs to them. We do not remember that he anywhere calls Governor Robinson "the Saviour of Kansas"—a phrase which the partizans of Brown and Lane are fond of associating with their names. The burden of his contention is that, in the border troubles and during the Civil War, Robinson rendered great services to Kansas—a position not likely to be successfully assailed. In the prosecution of his task many of the chief events of Kansas history pass under review. If Professor Blackmar does not throw much new light upon the subject, he certainly contributes to it no fresh confusion. The narrative might have been made more effective by compression. At times it carries a burden of details which cloud its distinctness and contribute little in the way of compensation.

The most serious criticisms of Governor Robinson have been occasioned, not so much by what he did in the territorial days, as by what he said about them after they were past. The fact that he outlived John Brown thirty-five years and General Lane twenty-eight; that he had both the opportunity and the disposition to put his version of the border struggle before the public is thought by some to have given him an advantage over rivals in the award of honors. In the first place he is charged with introducing into Kansas history "the curious myth" that there were two well-defined parties in the territory, "the one wishing to carry its ends by war, the other by peace," where, as a matter of fact, no distinctively peace sentiment existed. Professor Blackmar in reply quotes from the address of Governor Stanton at the old settlers' meeting at Bismarck Grove in 1884 to the effect that on his arrival in Kansas he found the Free-State party divided in opinion—one faction advocating extreme measures and the other moderate. He might also have quoted from a remarkable speech which Lane delivered at Lawrence twenty-seven years earlier. The immediate occasion of that speech was President Buchanan's characterization of him in a message to Congress as a turbulent and dangerous border leader. Adroitly avoiding all discussion of his own personal record or that of the radicals he reviewed the course of the Free-State party and contended that from first to last its *policy* had been pacific. Or if Lane's testimony needed corroboration, Professor Blackmar might have reinforced it by that of John Brown, who in a speech delivered at Concord in the spring of 1857 assailed "the peace party" in Kansas—the party which "discountenanced violence."

The other point of criticism relates to "the Pottawatomie massacre." On the appearance of Townsley's confessions in 1881, Governor Robinson

publicly denounced the affair and in no very measured terms. Some three or four years afterwards a letter of his, written to the late Judge Hanway in 1878, came to light, in which he said that he never "had much doubt that Captain Brown was the author of the blow at Pottawatomie," because he was the only man who "comprehended the situation . . . and had the nerve to strike it." This letter, eagerly caught up by enemies of Governor Robinson, furnished them a convenient text for uncomplimentary discourse. His defense was that, when he wrote the letter, he did not know the facts—that he never fully understood the situation until Townsley's narrative was printed. In passing upon the validity of this defense we are to remember that, for reasons not particularly difficult to conjecture, the Free-State folk avoided looking too closely into the Pottawatomie transaction. They by no means neglected border-ruffian outrages; but here was another story in regard to which they, like the Republican members of the Congressional investigating committee of 1856, preferred the bliss of ignorance. Under the circumstances they were quite in the mood to believe that a desperate state of affairs, which demanded the most heroic measures, existed at Dutch Henry's Crossing. Townsley made his statement with reluctance. It was only after repeated and urgent solicitations that he consented to do it. The gentlemen to whom it was dictated—one of them a prominent Kansas lawyer and a well-equipped student of Kansas history—were deeply impressed with his intelligence and sincerity. When this statement, which dissipated the enveloping mass of rumors, surmises and perversions and disclosed the essential facts, was published, not only Governor Robinson but the friends of John Brown as well, changed their attitude in reference to the so-called "executions." The former shifted from apology to denunciation—the latter from negation to defense. In explanation all offer the plea of imperfect information. And we should certainly wish to hear counsel before allowing it in the one case and denying it in the other.

LEVERETT W. SPRING.

*Lee at Appomattox and Other Papers.* By CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1902. Pp. 387.)

THIS volume is made up of detached papers of very unequal length, not to say of unequal value,—a remark made not for invidious comparison, but only to notice a fact. Where all is good and valuable, discrimination and comparison are not of prime importance.

The title paper—"Lee at Appomattox"—has attracted most attention, but seems to the present writer to be of least value, and is of least length. Still it emphasizes strikingly what is perhaps the wisest act of Lee's career,—the determination, for himself as well as for his army, that the surrender at Appomattox should be the end of the war. It was an essentially bold determination, for Lee was not the commander-in-chief of the Confederate forces, but only the general in command of the army of Northern Virginia. Lee, however, knew his army

was the last reliance and hope of the Confederacy ; and he must have known, too, that nothing but a desultory, irregular struggle could be kept up after his surrender. It is most interesting to know, as Mr. Adams shows, that Lee had maturely considered the issue and had reached his conclusion before the last step must be taken. He had evidently taken thought, too, of a contingency which did not arise, — the refusal of his army to follow his example of surrender. There is true pathos and true heroism of a very high order in these words of Lee to a confidential friend and officer just before the final act: "And as for myself, you young men might go to bushwhacking, but I am too old ; and even if it were right for me to disperse the army, I should surrender myself to General Grant, as the only proper course for one of my years and position." It is not easy to point to any finer example of poise of character and unselfish obedience to duty in the annals of military or civil life of any age. The scene and the act, the man and the event, put Lee, to use a familiar phrase, in the company of Plutarch's heroes. It is a good service of Mr. Adams to have set this passage clearly before the world.

By far the longest and most important paper of the volume is entitled "The Treaty of Washington: Before and After." We say most important because it presents in broad outline and in well-chosen details a very large and influential chapter of our recent history. We think it plain that no other man could have done this so well, from so full and minute knowledge, and in a style at once so trenchant and vivid. The course of English feeling, the sequence and incidents of the diplomacy of England and the United States from 1861 to 1871 are a twice-told tale to Mr. Adams, and into this narrative and review he has put a wealth of personal characterization of the chief actors and of painting of the great scenes and crises of the eventful period, which makes its 220 odd pages fascinating with the liveliest personal and historical interest. It was necessary to review the whole course of events of the ten years which immediately preceded the treaty of Washington in order to put the final transaction in its proper setting. Mr. Adams has taken space to do this. Especially he has not shrunk from passing positive judgments upon actors as well as events. Here he has of course had to meet the usual fortune of critics of individuals. The present writer does not regard it as ground of wise criticism that one who writes of recent events paints men and manners and motives as seems to him justly. Good faith, a fair spirit, is all that can be rightly required. Mr. Adams's judgments of many individuals have been, and doubtless will be, seriously disputed ; but in our belief no fair charge of intentional misrepresentation will ever lie against the treatment of individuals in this free and outspoken paper. Elsewhere the present writer has expressed his dissent and the reasons therefor from Mr. Adams's judgment of one large figure on his canvas, but he recognizes not the less that the canvas is a large one and that it has been drawn and filled with much skill and general fidelity to facts.

The treaty itself Mr. Adams regards as the complement of the Emancipation Proclamation, "rounding out," to quote his words, "and com-

pleting the work of our Civil War." "The verdict of history," he continues, "must then be that the blood and treasure so freely poured out by us between Sumter and Appomattox were not expended in vain; for through it and because of it, the last vestiges of piracy vanished from the ocean, as slavery had before disappeared from the land."

Notwithstanding the length of this paper the treatment of its topic is necessarily succinct and compendious. The ten years covered by it will require for full historical exposition hundreds of pages to each of Mr. Adams's ten. But, as already intimated, this paper will long stand as the best short review of its period and theme. Its value lies especially in the fact that it is largely enriched and illustrated by first-hand investigations and hitherto unpublished material. This refers principally to the private papers of Hamilton Fish to which Mr. Adams has fortunately been given access and from which he has drawn important information. While we see no evidence of undue effort to apotheosize Mr. Fish, yet the result is undoubtedly, so far as this paper goes, to give him a place in the ranks of practical statesmen considerably higher than the general estimation has heretofore given him. To Mr. Fish, to his initiative as well as guidance, to his sound valuation of the situation—its men, especially President Grant, and its background of public opinion both in England and here—to his patience and tenacity in pursuing his clearly defined policy and end, Mr. Adams does full justice; some will feel more than justice, with less than justice to some others. For his implied or inferential, as well as his expressed, estimate of Mr. Fish's statesmanship, there appears to be good grounds. Mr. Fish's achievements as Grant's Secretary of State, especially his conduct of the whole matter of the treaty of Washington and its sequel, the Geneva Arbitration, furnish a striking example of the easy ability with which a great public transaction may be handled by one who may have been, and still be, rated as commonplace or the extreme opposite of brilliant. Mr. Fish's figure in the public eye till 1869 was small, though he had held the highest offices in the gift of the Empire state. He made no set speeches. For diplomacy as a business or as a study it is not known that he cared either during his previous public career or during his subsequent retirement prior to 1869. Yet with all this lack of what is usually regarded as necessary equipment, to which should be added a notable absence of personal ambition, Mr. Adams makes it clear that Mr. Fish was the author and finisher of the whole great work of this treaty from the start in his own parlors at Washington to the conclusion at Geneva. Controversy over him will rage so long as men persist, as Mr. Adams here does, in attacking and depreciating others associated with him; but this ought not to lead to failure to put due estimate on his chief work or to denial of his full title to the rank of a prudent, forceful, and successful statesman in the high field of domestic and foreign diplomacy.

Of the remaining three papers, importance of contents and space at our disposal dictate notice here of but one—the paper entitled "An Undeveloped Function." This paper of 65 pages is, shortly speaking, an

effort to show the low plane on which the discussions of our gravest public questions have hitherto been conducted, and to point out a remedy. Mr. Adams finds it easy, by a swift review of our Presidential canvasses since 1860 to show the correctness of his criticism. He concludes that "taken as a whole, viewed in the gross and perspective, the retrospect leaves much to be desired,"—a summation evidently not open to the criticism often, perhaps not without a degree of justice, made on Mr. Adams of over-statement. Of the whole development of what we often hear called political thought and education in our Presidential canvasses, our author finally declares with more emphasis and more adequacy of characterization: "It has been at best a babel of the commonplace."

To his own query, "Wherein lies the remedy?" Mr. Adams's answer is a singular one; in substance, this: Assemble the American Historical Association, for example, and there in the thick of the canvass, let its members discuss the great present issues of Trusts, Imperialism, etc., and thus make appeal to the real intelligence of the country. It is hardly needful to specify the impassable hindrances to the application of the remedy, or its inefficacy, if otherwise practicable. But Mr. Adams gives us something far wiser and better than his remedy. He himself proceeds to discuss the so-called burning topics of the day—trusts and monopolies, currency, and imperialism. Passing by the discussion of all but the last, it may be said, we think, without exaggeration, that in 20 pages (pp. 316-335) Mr. Adams has presented the soundest, best-reasoned, and most impressive discussion we have yet had of the essential substance of what we now know as imperialism—its source, its motive, its end, its effect, its necessary final result. In these few pages he moves with the steady, firm step of a master, calling in for reproof and instruction the aptest lessons of history and the safest conclusions of philosophy applied to politics or political concerns. The volume would deserve warm and wide welcome if only for this one score of pages.

Mr. Adams as a writer is not to be praised without reserve. Certain literary and moral qualities which are fair topics for criticism, appear in all he writes. Our space would not permit us here to elucidate this remark, if we were disposed to do it. Nor does it temper the heartiness of welcome with which we receive the volume—a volume which in its whole effect adds to our stock of light and wisdom, and everywhere by its free vision and unhampered tone uplifts and cheers those who would know the truth and be guided by it

D. H. CHAMBERLAIN.

*The Life of John Ancrum Winslow, Rear Admiral United States Navy, Who Commanded the "Kearsarge" in her Action with the Confederate Cruiser "Alabama."* By JOHN M. ELLICOTT. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Pp. x, 282.)

THE diligent and painstaking author of this book has done well with his subject. If in certain parts the book seems padded with matters of



humdrum routine common to the career of the average navy man, the author may be pardoned in his effort to give a minute chronicle of the officer's life afloat and ashore, although the bulk of it relates professionally to the uneventful days of peace.

Admiral Winslow came from old New England Puritan stock on his father's side and on his mother's side from North Carolina stock of Scotch strain. He was born in Wilmington, N. C., November 19, 1811, and spent his childhood days there. But his father, Edward Winslow, a Bostonian, sent the future admiral and his brother Edward, in due course of time, to Massachusetts to be educated. While at school, at Dedham, John fortunately attracted the attention of Daniel Webster, who obtained for the lad a midshipman's appointment in the navy. This was in 1827, John then being eighteen years of age. In 1827, after various cruising incident to naval life, he was promoted to a lieutenancy. In that grade he saw much service afloat in the Mediterranean, in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific, as well as brief tours of duty on shore. As an officer of the splendid but ill-fated steam-frigate "Missouri," he saw her suddenly destroyed by fire at Gibraltar, August 26, 1843, and was honored with the appointment as bearer of despatches to the Navy Department reporting that memorable catastrophe to the government. In the Mexican War he was associated at times on terms of intimacy and good fellowship with Lieutenant Raphael Semmes, who was to become his most notable antagonist in our Civil War on one of the most dramatic occasions of that conflict.

Now passing over his further service career until he reached the grade of commander in 1855, we may say that his criticisms in his home letters of Commodore Connor's operations in the Gulf during the war with Mexico might well have been omitted in his biography. He could not know the tenor of the Commodore's instructions and what he wrote in confidence to his wife in disparagement of Connor's actions, should have been regarded as confidential and not given to the public in cold print.

Soon after the outbreak of our Civil War, Winslow was ordered as assistant to flag-officer Foote who had been placed in command of the Union naval forces in the northern Mississippi and its tributaries. In such capacity, Winslow did able and effective work, not only as an organizer but as an energetic and vigilant commanding officer; but when Foote, owing to wounds received in battle, had to relinquish his command to flag-officer Davis, he asked to be relieved and sent to other duty. His request, however, was couched in such terms that both Davis and the Navy Department took offense and he was placed on furlough, a punishment in time of war almost worse than death. But Winslow, keeping his temper, wrote an explanatory letter so satisfying to Secretary Welles that he was soon restored, November 5, 1862, to his proper status.

A month later he received orders to take passage in the "Vanderbilt," from New York to Fayal to take command of the "Kearsarge." Now the opportunity had come to him which he was to improve to his own ineffaceable distinction and lasting glory to the country, but through for-

tuitous circumstances, over which he had no control, he had to wait at Fayal three months and a half before assuming his command. This was on April 8, 1863, and he was charged with the onerous duty of hunting down the "Alabama" and other Confederate cruisers and their capture or destruction. The "Alabama," in particular, was the special object of his quest. For nearly two years she had roamed the seas under the able command of Semmes, and had destroyed a large part of our merchant marine. Welcomed, encouraged and petted in English ports, she managed to evade our cruisers at all points and seemed to have a charmed exemption from every effort to meet her and bring her to battle. Of her call at Simon's Bay, near Capetown, August, 1863, Lieutenant Sinclair of the "Alabama" said in a letter to his mother: "If a Yankee man of war comes in they drive her off in twenty-four hours; and if they complain that they are in want of repairs, the English order a board of their own officers, and they always decide that the repairs are not necessary; but in our case they only say, 'We are glad to see you, old fellows, make yourselves at home, and anything you want let us know.'" That tells the whole story of English officialdom towards the Union cause during the war of which Craven, Wilkes, Pickering, Winslow and others of our captains had ample experience in British waters.

In the fourteen months of Winslow's arduous work of search and blockade, before he was able to bring the "Alabama" to bay, he was constantly harassed by the British authorities, and if he seemed to lose his head diplomatically on one or two occasions and bring upon himself an admonitory letter from Minister Adams, it was not to be wondered at. But all things have an end. On the 12th of June, 1864, Winslow got word that the "Alabama" had put into Cherbourg the day before and he proceeded thither with all despatch. Arriving off the breakwater on the 14th, he steamed in and out of the harbor, getting a good look at the "Alabama" in so doing, and then proceeded to blockade the port. Five days later, or on Sunday the 19th of June, the "Alabama" steamed gallantly out of the harbor to seek her eager antagonist and throw down the grim gauge of battle. The first shot was fired by the "Alabama." This was at 10:57 A. M. Sixty-five minutes later she hauled down her flag in distress and at 12:24 P. M. went to the bottom. To the Confederates had come defeat but not dishonor. Semmes as he was about to go out and engage the "Kearsarge" had written Confederate flag-officer Barron that the "most of combats were always uncertain," and taking the uncertain chance he lost. For a full account of this famous ship-duel, so dramatic in incident, so momentous in import, we must refer the reader to the author's stirring narration. Here Ellicott is at his best, telling the splendid story with technical skill and clearness of detail in a way altogether graphic and admirable.

At this day, it is difficult to conceive the thrill of delight that swept over the loyal North when the news of the "Alabama's" destruction reached the country. Winslow, his officers and men immediately became the heroes of the hour and after the "Kearsarge's" arrival home, they

were fêted without stint. Winslow himself was thanked by Congress and advanced by the President to the grade of commodore. In due season he became rear admiral, his last active service being in command of the Pacific squadron. Fortunate in the opportunity that came to him, his name goes down the stream of time as one of the nation's victory-achieving seamen, well deserving the plaudits of his countrymen.

GEO. E. BELKNAP.

*Reconstruction and the Constitution, 1866-1876.* By JOHN W. BURGESS, Ph.D., LL.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. 342.)

LOOKING at the Reconstruction period from the point of view of the historian, it is certainly the most difficult in American history. Indeed, there is probably no more difficult subject to be found anywhere in modern history. To arrive at any fixed opinion of one's own concerning the main things that were done is hard enough. It is conceivable that a really intelligent student, possessed of all the important facts, and not without the power of sympathetic comprehension, might fail altogether in this initial part of his work. He might never achieve a view, a theory, a judgment, on which his own mind would rest with any degree of satisfaction, which he could with reasonable conscience and assurance commend to his readers.

Granting, however, that one has come to have one's own views, that one continues to see the matter in the same way, and can see it no other way, to do anything for one's reader is still uncommonly hard. One can of course let him sense the same confusions one has been struggling with. There is a certain content to be got by merely making sure that one has chosen intelligently and set down correctly the important events at Washington and in each of the southern states, no matter what the order or the form is. There is satisfaction, too, in stating boldly one's judgments of the men and the policies. When these things are done, however, nothing is done but the gathering of dry bones together. Perhaps it is enough to satisfy the demands of what Professor Burgess calls "sound political science." It enables one to gratify the liking all scholars have for working problems. It does not satisfy the ordinary reader. The writer, if he be at all artist, if he be completely an historian in his aspiration, can only acquiesce in his own work. He must fall back on his limitations or the impossibility of the larger task.

There is little to suggest that Professor Burgess had the larger task in mind. What he has attempted permits us to think that he did not fall back from it for any lack of courage. He has had the courage to commit himself unreservedly to a theory and a plan of Reconstruction. In the seven pages of his first chapter he announces his creed as boldly as if there never had been an issue over the matter among such men as Lincoln and Sumner and Stevens and Chase. He states his plan in his still briefer preface. Both theory and plan are intelligent. His courage

in so stating them is not diminished by the circumstance that foot-notes are not employed in his review, and that he is under no necessity to supply, that way or any way, the material for controverting his opinions. The remainder of the volume, the last chapter excepted, which deals with one or two questions of our foreign relations, is a fairly clear setting forth of the Presidential and the Congressional policies, always with judgments and discussions. The actual process of Reconstruction in the Southern commonwealths is not followed in much detail. The carpet-bag régime is treated, as Professor Burgess tells us it should be, only in the vaguest outline. It is best, he thinks, to deal with it "briefly and impersonally," avoiding criminations and seeking only lessons of warning. There is no attempt at narration, no painting of conditions, no concern about such things as atmosphere, little psychology, no drama. Of these things, apparently, "political science" can take no account, if it is going to stay "sound." It is all statement and reasoning; forcible, but hard; relieved by no grace of style, suffused with no tenderness, charged with no enthusiasm. It is a book which makes one question the relation of political science to life. Yet there is no event, no law, no theory discussed in the body of this work which did not relate itself closely to the lives of countless men and women and children, dead, and living, and unborn.

There are many of the specific conclusions which invite comment; some of them occasion surprise. For example, Mr. Shellabarger, of Ohio, is credited with something like leadership of the Republicans in Congress when they came to plant themselves on a theory. Mr. Blaine's opinion that Seward's influence determined President Johnson's course is accepted, though it is not sustained by the testimony of those who came closest to the President. Professor Burgess seems to think there actually was a danger that the Southern congressmen chosen under the Johnson governments, uniting with Northern Democrats, might get the Confederate debt assumed and the Union debt repudiated. He says, at least, that the danger of these things was "somewhat exaggerated." One would expect the American sense of humor to have asserted itself by this time on that particular point, even if one never ventured so far into the consideration of human motives as to perceive that the course marked out for the Northern Democrats, in that extraordinary foreboding was, humanly speaking, impossible. Stanton is condemned very plainly for his holding on to his place against Johnson's will. Here, for once, the author's positiveness is acceptable. He is equally positive that two-thirds of the states which had not attempted to secede were enough to ratify the amendments. He is at pains to be fair to Andrew Johnson, and does not go too far in what of praise he has to say of our most unfortunate President. His judgment seems as good as his courage when he praises Hayes and commends his administration. On that point, the few students of this very recent period seem to be approaching a consensus. *Per contra*, he says of Grant's argument in favor of annexing San Domingo that "it would be difficult to find another message of a Presi-

dent of the United States which contained an equal amount of such extravagant nonsense."

W. G. BROWN.

*Éléments d'une Psychologie Politique du Peuple Américain.* Par ÉMILE BOUTMY. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1902. Pp. x, 366.)

THIS book is a companion to M. Boutmy's *Psychologie Politique du Peuple Anglais au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, and like that it is interesting and suggestive; but it is a better book, for the different parts are more closely connected by a central idea, and there is less that is purely fanciful or exaggerated.

The author begins with a review of the work of Bryce and de Tocqueville, defending the latter against the criticisms that have lately been made upon him. Bryce's work he finds, as everyone else does, admirable; his only criticism being that Mr. Bryce confines himself too exclusively to portraying the facts, and attempts too little to study the psychology of the people. The criticism is doubtless based upon a truth, but whether Mr. Bryce's book would have been improved by the method of analysis suggested may be doubted.

The kernel of Mr. Boutmy's thought is found in the opening pages of his second chapter, where he says that among the essential conditions for the formation of a nation are the existence of a stable population, and its effective occupation of a definite territory. These conditions, he points out, are not to be found in the United States; and, in fact, he attributes the prevailing character of the American people to the continual migrations of the individuals of which it is composed, and to the unlimited land to be occupied in the western territory. "The source," he remarks (p. 26), "of every impulse to which the will has been subjected, and the matrix of every impression received by the character, are here the obvious necessity, the compulsion, if one can use the word, to reconnoitre, to occupy and to utilize this immense territory. This necessity furnishes, in a measure, to the imagination its notion of sovereign good. All other motives efface themselves before it, or impregnate it. In a word, the United States are above all an economic society. They are only in a secondary sense an historic and political society."

This theme he works out in many different phases. He describes the original settlement of New England and of Virginia, the beginnings of the movement towards the west, with the growing instability of the population consequent thereupon, the influx of European immigrants into the eastern states, and the sparse settlement of new regions in the west; all tending, as he thinks, to prevent the growth of uniform national characteristics, and true national feeling.

He discusses at some length the question of immigration, pointing out that all the different classes of persons who have come to America have tended to increase the homogeneity of the people in spite of differences in race, origin and character. The earlier ones, even down to the middle of the nineteenth century, were, he says, at least alike in the vigor of their will, their spirit of adventure, and the desire of gain;

while the more recent immigrants who have been of a feebler fibre, have, for that very reason, been the more ready to receive the impress of the surroundings among which they have fallen.

In the third chapter he points out how much more ancient the conception of the nation is in Europe than in America, and in following out this idea he comes nearer to the fanciful than in any other part of the book; for he says that the Americans have not the same feeling of patriotism as Europeans. That sentiment, he says, does not appeal to their imagination, their public spirit being based rather upon a superabundance of individual energy and an enlightened conviction of self-interest.

In the fourth and fifth chapters on "The State and the Government" he makes the remark, which contains no little truth, that the European states and the American Republic belong to two distinct natural species, so that grafts from one to the other are highly likely to remain sterile. He goes on to point out that in France royalty made the nation, and the nation made the individual; whereas in America it is the individual who has made and marked off the functions of the state. The theory is developed, as the reader may well imagine, at great length and under many forms, which it is impossible to describe in the space of this review. It is brought into connection with the thesis already propounded, that the United States is first and foremost an economic and not a political society. It would be interesting, if possible, to refer to many of his deductions. Some of them are very keenly put, as, for example, where he says that the checks and balances of power which have been represented as the marked trait of parliamentary government in Europe, are really only secondary and transitory. The real aim and crown of the system is the intensity of power, the authority and firmness of hand of the government due to the confidence which it draws from its manifest accord with the people. He points out, of course, that the American system is founded on exactly the opposite principle. In the course of his discussion he makes many interesting observations upon the organization of our government, state and national, and here he falls into occasional mistakes, especially in matters of law. He does not quite appreciate, for instance, the binding effect of decisions as precedents which practically enable a court to settle the law by a single case which is brought before it; nor does he seem to understand the meaning of the decisions of the Supreme Court on the protection of civil rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. He sums up the difference between the French and American ways of looking at the government with his usual terseness. The Frenchman says: "Let us rather be governed badly than not governed at all," while the American says: "Let us be as little governed as possible, rather than be governed badly;" and speaking of the conservative tendency of our government he remarks that under the present organization the states find themselves under the most anti-progressive system which can be imagined. The chapters end with a discussion of the importance and the principles of local government.



The sixth chapter contains an interesting discussion of religion and ideals in America. There is not space to describe his views here, but merely to explain that he thinks the Americans lack inspiration in their religion, which has rather an ethical and practical, than a theological and imaginative, character.

The last chapter is devoted to imperialism and the Constitution, and in it he points out that the desire of expansion is not new in America, but is the outcome of a policy followed constantly for more than a century, and has its foundations in the most undoubted traditions of the American spirit. Hence, he believes it will not upset the institutions and traditions of the country, because in its essence it is not inconsistent with them.

A. L. LOWELL.

*Japan: Its History, Arts and Literature.* By Captain F. BRINKLEY. [Oriental Series.] (Boston and Tokyo: J. B. Millet Co. 1901. Vols. I.-VI., pp. 260; 286; 256; 267; 260; 301.)

UNTIL the Japanese write scientific history, we must rely upon those foreigners, who to mastery of the sources add industry and insight, for an intelligible picture of Japanese life in the past. While it is unsafe for a native at home to dissect ancient legends, the alien has free play. Happily we have here the work of one who began thirty-five years ago, in Japan, to acquire the language, striving to interpret the life around him by a knowledge of origins. These six volumes from his pen, to be followed by six more, form probably the best work that could at the present time be produced. To the three names, all of Englishmen, who are the "great lights of Japanese scholarship" to whom Captain Brinkley dedicates his work, we may justly add his own. Though subordinate to artistic features, Japanese history is here quite fully treated both with power and insight in this sumptuously illustrated work, which is to be completed in twelve volumes. Except some general notes in the appendix to each volume, there are no references to authorities. In so far the work lacks that guarantee, which the exacting critic demands. However, with the general lack of knowledge of original Japanese sources among Occidental readers, it is hard to see how references could be supplied, especially in a work like this. Those who know the author's breadth and depth of scholarship and the saturation of his mind with Japanese ideas, as well as his cosmopolitan experience and acquaintance with modern critical methods, can read these volumes with satisfaction. Not that Captain Brinkley is infallible, for on American references and illustrations, we find ourselves compelled to make allowance occasionally for parallax. There are not a few places, also, in which he ought to have given us exact translations of important brief documents or passages. Furthermore, as history, the work is seriously lacking in not allowing for that continuous fertilization of the Japanese mind through contact with Europeans, and the continuous infiltration of Occidental ideas through the Dutch, in which was scarcely an intermission for nearly three centuries. Even before the arrival of Perry these had produced a small army

of physicians, critical inquirers and men hungry for more knowledge from the west. Nor is any allowance made for the influence of ideas derived from the work of Iberian missionaries during eighty years, which certainly modified powerfully the Shinto and Buddhist sects, besides keeping up continuously a subterranean history of Christianity in the islands. Yet on the whole we know of no other writer in any country who could have woven this history with such richness, color and accuracy. Moreover the pages show the practised pen of the veteran editor of *The Japan Mail*.

The author's method is first to get behind the looking-glass of popular Japanese tradition (which has served so handsomely as the age-old political engine for unifying the nation and restoring the imperial power, yet furnishing withal a motor for modern progress) and then to step out into the modern world of scholarship and tell what he has found. Until the fourth century the Japanese were without letters or almanacs. Their two most ancient books, written respectively A.D. 712 and A.D. 720, while containing material for history, are mostly compilations of myths and traditions. The *Kojiki* in pure Japanese is an artless narrative. The *Nihongi* is woven together with Chinese philosophy and classic quotation—or plagiarism. Captain Brinkley's conclusion, in harmony with that of probably every critical scholar, is that "among many borrowings made by Japan from China, the idea of her 'age of Gods' has to be included." In a word the earlier historiography of the island empire is largely a reflection of models borrowed from China. The rise to power of the house or clan, of which the chief was called the Mikado, and the fluctuations of his measure of power constitutes in epitome Japanese history. Chinese arts and letters were the first influences making for culture, but Buddhism was the great civilizing, centralizing and unifying influences. The author's clear demarcation of each epoch—prehistoric, early historic, Nara, Hei-an or Kioto, the military, the Tokugawa—and his keen appreciations of each feature and influence are delightful to the scholar. Epitomizing the social, moral and legal aspects of the Yedo epoch (1604–1868), which of all is best known to foreigners, he surveys rapidly the era of Meiji, or enlightened government, that is, the reign of the present Emperor (1868–1902 +). He then opens before us the financial and economic conditions, foreign politics, steps of progress, creed and caste, religion and rites, and superstition, closing with descriptions of the festal and ceremonial side of life and the history of foreign commerce.

One is impressed in reading this story of Japan with the resourceful power of the Japanese, with their originality, and their ability to make much out of little,—whether in the way of enjoyment or of business, or of equipping themselves for modern struggle and the challenges of the future. Confucianism, Buddhism and Bushido (the school of the knight) have been the great culture elements. Chivalry in the Samurai and their wonderful arts, from which the whole world now gladly learns, are the consummate flowers of their genius.

Volume VI. contains an analytical index of the whole work as thus

far issued, together with a large colored map showing the old empire with the modern railway routes and also the newer possessions of Formosa and the Kurile Islands. In the list of emperors, of whom one hundred and twenty-three are counted, the earlier are noted as legendary, the first seventeen being extraordinarily long lived and purely mythical. The dates of the reign and relation of each ruler to his successor are given, together with a list of the shoguns and a table of dates with list of gods and goddesses and celebrated characters in Japanese history. Three volumes on the arts of Japan especially indexed and three on the history and arts of China from the same author are to follow.

WILLIAM ELLIOTT GRIFFIS.

*Historical Sources in Schools*; Report to the New England History Teachers' Association by a Select Committee. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1902, pp. ix, 299.) This in a degree is a companion volume to the *Report of the Committee of Seven* which appeared three years ago; it is published by the same firm and in the same general form as the earlier report. In addition to a general introduction on the use of sources in the schools, a list of accessible sources covering the field of history is given, with valuable comments on the character and usefulness of the material in question. The committee follows the division recommended by the Committee of Seven, and has consequently made a general grouping under the four heads: Ancient History; Medieval and Modern European History; English History; American History.

Concerning the extent to which sources can be used, the report fortunately takes the middle ground, it does not advocate abandoning the use of a text and studying from the sources alone in the secondary schools. Probably few teachers believe that pupils can be taught successfully without the use of a text-book. But there are a great many still in existence who think that sources cannot be used at all; such teachers ought, in fairness to their pupils and their profession, to ponder the introductory pages of this volume and remember that, if they are intent not simply on cramming boys for entrance examinations but on fitting them for life, they are losing opportunity for making their subject really a thing of living interest. The book may also be commended to those—erstwhile known as teachers of history—who do not quite know what sources are, in other words are ignorant of the essential character of the subject they profess to teach.

A great deal of hard work has been expended in the preparation of this volume, and the labor will not be lost. That the comparatively untrained teacher may be overwhelmed by the wealth of suggestion is certainly quite likely; and perhaps even farther discrimination should have been made between what is of possible service and what is vivid, direct and positively helpful. To discourage and burden a pupil by unintelligent reference to a document beyond his thoughtful comprehension, is apt to be a very dangerous error. But after all, must books forever be made for untrained teachers who must make the acquaintance of the tools of their trade after they begin active practice?

*The Trend of the Centuries : or the Historical Unfolding of the Divine Purpose*, seems to describe fairly a recent book by Rev. A. W. Archibald, D.D. (Boston and Chicago, the Pilgrim Press, pp. 419). It is the title chosen for a series of twenty chapters, originally discourses, whose common object is to set forth the idea of "God in history," and thus remove doubt and strengthen faith in an overruling Power. They begin with a survey of the field: "The Whirling Wheels of Divine Providence"; and then march hurriedly through the ages to "The Triumphant Nineteenth Century."

E. W. D.

*Encyclopædia Biblica*. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. Volume III. (New York, The Macmillan Co.; London, Macmillan and Co., 1902, pp. xvi; columns, 3,988.) For notices of Volumes I. and II. see this REVIEW for April, 1900, and July, 1901. The present volume (which beginning at L goes through the letter P) is rich in historical material; only the longer articles can be mentioned here. Taking these in chronological order, we have, first, a general geographical sketch of Palestine (by Socin, W. M. Müller and others), in which is given, among other things, a list of the Palestinian places named in the Egyptian inscriptions that can be identified. A separate article is devoted to Phœnicia (by Ed. Meyer), in which it is attempted to give an accurate statement of what is known of the beginnings of the Phœnicians—a point on which there has been much vague writing; all that can be said with certainty is that their cities existed as early as the fifteenth century B. C. Meyer gives also a clear and judicious account of their religion, which was substantially identical with the other Canaanitish cults (including the early Hebrew), yet with features of its own. There can be no reasonable doubt that the Phœnicians were Semites. On the other hand, of another interesting and much-discussed Biblical people, the Philistines, it seems to be true that they were non-Semitic; such is the view taken in the article devoted to them (by G. F. Moore), which favors the theory of W. M. Müller that they came from the coast of Asia Minor, and were a warlike and not uncultivated people. There is a good deal to be said for this theory; but, in the absence of definite information, it is safer to reserve opinion—the name "Philistine" and other points about the people are obscure; by a curious chance they have given the country its name "Palestine." In the article "Mizraim" (by Cheyne) there is reference to a notable geographical and historical hypothesis that has lately come to the front. "Mizraim," or more properly "Misraim" (Arab, "Misr"), is the ordinary Hebrew term for Egypt; but the Assyrian inscriptions reveal a Musri in North Arabia, and attempts are being made to refer to this latter much in the Old Testament that has been held to refer to Egypt, one scholar asserting that the Israelites never were in Egypt, and that their exodus was from Arabia. Apart from such violent suppositions, the Arabian Musri sometimes throws light on the Old Testament statements, but the scantiness of the data warns us to be cautious. In connection with the North Arabian region Cheyne in va-

rious articles undertakes an historical reconstruction of "Jerahmeel," a clan or tribe in Southern Canaan, finally absorbed by Judah, and he substitutes this name for others in a number of cases (for example, for Elijah, Elisha, Gog, Nimrod); such substitutions the reader must take as conjecture, not as history. Under the title "Mesha" there is a full account of the famous Moabite Stone (by Driver). In the article on Persia (by F. Brown and Tiele) we have the latest results from inscription, and in that on "Papyri" a statement (by Deissmann) of the recent remarkable finds in Egypt. The Maccabean history is treated at length (by C. C. Torrey) — a period of great importance. Other articles of historical interest are those on "Magic," "Music," and "Names." It is worthy of mention, as an illustration of the critical hospitality of the *Encyclopædia*, that a portion of the article on the Apostle Paul has been assigned to van Manen, a leading representative of the school (mostly Dutch) that denies the existence of any genuine writings of Paul.

C. H. T.

*Roman Constitutional History 753-44 B. C.* By John E. Granrud. (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1902, pp. xii, 294.) In writing this handbook, which appears in Allyn and Bacon's admirable "College Latin Series," it has been the author's purpose "to provide collateral reading for students of Latin, to supplement the ordinary school histories of Rome, and, especially, to furnish an introduction to a thorough study of the political institutions of the Roman republic." With this threefold end in view he has given us a lucid and well-articulated account of the development of Roman institutions to the death of Julius Cæsar, combining in its arrangement both the historical and the systematic point of view and noticing many of the economic, personal and other factors in the changes described. As the author confines himself to the straightforward statement of results and makes no attempt to discuss disputed questions, to cite the sources of our knowledge or to introduce the student, even by means of a brief bibliography or an occasional foot-note, to the literature of the subject, one can hardly help asking whether his book will satisfy any general need. Students who have advanced beyond the point where their questions can be answered by one or another of the text-books already available might perhaps better be referred to Mommsen or to a purely systematic account like Greenidge's *Roman Public Life* recently noticed in this REVIEW. If, however, there is a demand for another compendium of Roman history, with special reference to public law, one can only anticipate that Dr. Granrud's book will win the approval that it deserves on the score of its logical arrangement, its unaffected style and its completeness within its assigned limits. One might perhaps wish that it went further and included a brief account of the Augustan constitution, because this and not the monarchy of Julius Cæsar was the final settlement of the long revolutionary struggle to which the author naturally devotes almost half (and quite the better half) of his book. In his treatment of the earlier period

he has not sufficiently emancipated himself from the influence of Livy and of the hazardous constructions to which Mommsen gave the weight of his authority. We even find the story of the expulsion of the Tarquins and the legend of Virginia told as if they were presumably true; and the patricians again do duty as the only original citizens of Rome, although Botsford's admirable text-book has already acquainted many of those for whom Mr. Granrud's book is intended with the more reasonable view, that the plebeians were from the start as truly members of the body politic as, for instance, the commons in every period of English history.

H. A. SILL.

*Town Life in Ancient Italy* (Boston, Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1902, pp. 62) is a translation by William E. Waters of New York University, of Professor Ludwig Friedländer's "Städtewesen in Italien im ersten Jahrhundert," originally published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* in 1879 and since then reprinted as an introduction to the author's edition of Petronius. It has chapters on the appearance and condition of the towns, on municipal government, on social classes in the rural cities, on the fiscal management of rural cities and on their popular amusements, religious observances and relations with Rome. The original, written from the sources, to which full reference is made in the footnotes, is filled with interesting details of the everyday life in the Italian towns during the first century of our era. There is presented in attractive form and with scholarly accuracy the sort of information that the average student needs. It is well worth translating for the benefit of our school and college students who have so little insight into the actual life of the Romans about whom they read in the classical texts. It appeals also to the interest of readers of history in general as covering in an attractive way a field but little touched upon by English or American writers.

The translation is a readable one and in the main well done, though a few inaccuracies may be noted. On page 28 the "had been reduced" is a somewhat ambiguous rendering of "er habe klein angefangen." The failure also to cite a definite number of millions left by the parvenu spoils the point of Friedländer's observation in the next sentence in regard to the eagerness of the freedman to leave on his tombstone an exact record of the amount of his accumulations. The sentence on page 20 beginning, "The number of those," etc., does not correctly interpret the original.

J. H. D.

*Roman Africa: an Outline of the History of the Roman Occupation of North Africa*, based chiefly upon Inscriptions and Monumental Remains in that Country. By Alexander Graham. (New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1902, pp. xvi, 326.) The literary sources for the history of North Africa during the Roman period are meager. They surprise the reader occasionally by references to the fertility and wealth of the country, but give no just conception of the greatness of the territory under Roman rule, the density of its population in the more



avored regions, or its resources. Since the French occupation, which commenced with the capture of Algiers in 1830, every facility has been afforded for scientific exploration and excavations have been conducted on many ancient sites. The extent of the Roman dominion, which reached to the oases in the northern part of the Sahara, has been definitely determined, and a great amount of detailed information has been collected; when the second supplement to the eighth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* was issued, in 1894, the number of published African inscriptions was already more than 20,000, and each year since has made important additions to the list. The remains of Roman buildings of a monumental character at the present time are more numerous in North Africa than in any other part of the Empire outside of Italy.

Mr. Graham has endeavored, by utilizing both literary and monumental sources, to reconstruct in broad outline the history of Roman Africa from the close of the second Punic War to the latter part of the fifth century of our era. He follows the chronological order strictly; of the ten chapters the first treats of Rome and Carthage, the second of Africa under the Twelve Cæsars; the rest are concerned with the condition of the country in the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Alexander Severus, the Gordians, and the later Emperors. Brief descriptions of the vanished cities, and comments upon intellectual and social conditions in the Roman period, are woven into the narratives of the different reigns; to many readers the author's fresh and suggestive observations upon the Roman monuments and methods of construction will be of especial interest. The illustrations are of value. The two maps are quite inadequate; they are not sufficiently full, and the omission of all modern names is not offset by the separate list of ancient names with modern equivalents.

The author possesses the advantage of long familiarity with the country about which he writes, having traversed parts of it again and again. His material is on the whole well selected; his work is deficient in historical perspective and clearness of analysis. Though inscriptions are among his chief sources, he is not altogether reliable as an epigraphist; he occasionally uses antiquated and erroneous versions of important inscriptions in cases in which correct versions are easily accessible; instances in point are the dedications of the arches at Tripoli (p. 156; cf. *C. I. L.*, VIII. 24) and at Makter (p. 79; cf. *C. I. L.*, VIII. 621). But notwithstanding its shortcomings the book is welcome as filling a lacuna in our English literature of ancient history. It is fuller than the French work with which one naturally compares it, Boissier's charming *L'Afrique Romaine* (Paris, 1895), and will be consulted with profit by those who find it impracticable to resort to the original sources.

FRANCIS W. KELSEY.

*La Liberta Religiosa.* Per Avv. Francesco Ruffini, Prof. ordinario nell'Università di Torino. Volume I. Storia dell'Idea. (Turin,

Fratelli Bocca, 1901, pp. xi, 542.) The present volume is devoted to the development of the idea of religious liberty from the days of classical antiquity to the close of the eighteenth century; the second volume is to deal with the growth of religious liberty itself during the nineteenth century. The work is an elaborate, comprehensive and painstaking treatment of the subject in hand.

After an introductory chapter in which the fundamental conceptions—liberty of thought, of conscience, of worship, toleration, etc.—are carefully discriminated, the ideas that prevailed in classical antiquity, in the ancient and medieval church, and among the reformers and Socinians are presented in a chapter entitled "The Precursors." The views of the several reformers are accurately distinguished, the failure of the churches of the Reformation to grasp the idea of religious liberty is recognized, and the Socinians are given full credit for their advanced position in the matter. An interesting chapter follows on the influence of Holland in promoting the principles of religious liberty, and the remainder of the volume—more than two-thirds of the whole—deals with the development of those principles during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Protestant and Catholic countries, respectively. The comprehensiveness of this part of the work is sufficiently indicated by the titles of the sections: "English Independency"; "The School of Natural Rights in Germany"; "American Separation"; "The Growth of Tolerance in Switzerland and Scandinavia"; "French Rationalism"; "The Episcopal Movement (for local autonomy) in Austria"; "Rationalism and Episcopalianism in Poland, Belgium and Italy."

The work is an exceedingly valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, breadth of treatment, clearness, and convenience of arrangement being among its most conspicuous merits.

A. C. McG.

*Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung.* By Theodor Lindner, professor in the University of Halle. (Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta, erster Band, 1901, pp. xx, 479; zweiter Band, 1902, pp. x, 508.) Preceded by *Geschichtsphilosophie: Einleitung zu einer Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung* (1901, pp. xii, 206). These are the first installments of a history of the world since the migrations, in nine volumes, by a single writer. Since he has occupied himself with history—and that is near four decades—he has looked upon the investigation of details only as a means of gaining a picture of the whole. Not that he holds investigation of details lightly, for upon it rests all real historical knowledge; but his writings of that order, and a long experience in teaching—in which one has always to keep high points of view and look out over the whole field—now give him right, he hopes, to enter upon this general work. Also, the chief matter in such a work is that it be uniformly conceived; and that can only come through one person, if general history is to offer more than a mere putting together of special histories. Thus, in part, Dr. Lindner justifies his undertaking.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. VIII.—II.

The little volume of philosophy sets forth the fundamental thinking on which the history rests. It grew only slowly to its present state: written in a first draft years ago, then tested, developed and made clearer with long use, only recently — in the midst of increased interest in synthetic studies and under the stimulus of a richly extended literature upon the questions involved — has it been rounded out and put together in a final form. It does not offer a full treatment of all problems of historical philosophy; rather it aims simply to present, in one coherent piece, the writer's conception of history. "The leading thought was, to trace the evolution back to simple ground-facts which are to be seen in all times and among all peoples; ground-facts, which yet also show why history is everywhere different. For that seems to me the real problem: the rise of difference from like causes." Persistence and change we have always with us; history deals with man as a whole and is "the relation between persistence and change."

Such being the foundations, quite naturally "this History shall relate and make clear the becoming of our present world, in its entire content. It is conceived primarily as evolution-history." The introduction and four books of the first volume deal respectively with the Roman Empire and the Germans, through the invasions; the Byzantine Empire, to Heraclius; Islam, to the beginning of the ninth century, and the Byzantine Empire in the time of the struggle over images; the West, to the tenth century; China and India. The chief divisions of the second volume relate to the decline of Islam, the Byzantine world and the Crusades; the German emperorship and the papacy, and the western states, into the thirteenth century. The third volume will describe the Christian civilization of the Middle Ages, and carry the political history to the building of the Hapsburg power; the fourth will deal with the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation; and the five last will be devoted to modern history since the middle of the sixteenth century. Also each volume contains a table of contents, a digested list of the more important references, and an index of persons and places.

It seems bold for an honorable scholar to try a book like this, but the parts that have appeared so far give promise of an enduring work. It is fully thought out; it tells the truth sincerely as a gifted and experienced student sees it, and is of wholesome spirit. Besides, it reads well; the words fit closely and the sentences run gracefully. Such a record, though long, will have many readers and will be worthy of them.

E. W. D.

The second fascicle of the *Sources de l'Histoire de France*, by M. Auguste Molinier (Paris, A. Picard et Fils, 1902, pp. 322), covers the Capetian period from 987 to 1180, with chapters as follows: "Hugh Capet to Philip I."; "Letters and Poems of the Eleventh Century"; "Local History: Capetian Domain, Regions of the West, East, Center, South, Lands of the Empire, and North"; "Louis VI. and Louis VII."; "Letters and Poems of the Twelfth Century"; "The Great Norman

Historians"; "English Historians of the Twelfth Century"; "Monastic Orders: Cluny, Citeaux, and The Small Orders"; "The Normans in Italy"; "The Crusades, First and Second"; and "The Universal Chronicles." The scholarly features of the first fascicle also appear here: completeness, careful indications, clear arrangement, satisfying explanations, trustworthy judgments; there can be no student of the history of France who does not owe M. Molinier a lasting debt. It is welcome news, too, that this manual, which was to stop with the beginnings of the Italian wars, is now designed to go on to 1815; MM. H. Hauser, M. Tournoux and P. Caron are to deal with the period after 1494. E. W. D.

*Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges.* Von Reinhold Röhricht. (Innsbruck, Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1901, pp. xii, 268.) During the last thirty years much critical study has been devoted to the first Crusade but there has been no satisfactory history of the whole movement. Sybel's *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, published in 1841, was an important book to which all later students have been indebted. But in the second edition, published in 1881, Sybel made comparatively little improvement on the first, and neglected to use the work of other scholars who had shed light upon many a doubtful point. The third edition, published in 1900, is merely a reprinting of the second. No other work on the first Crusade deserves mention. Consequently it was natural that Röhricht's friends and admirers should urge him to undertake the task. For many years he has been known as one of the best authorities on the history of the Crusades. But until a few years ago he had written mainly on subjects connected with the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. His most important work is the *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (Innsbruck, 1897). He had not, however, neglected the study of the earlier period and was thoroughly conversant with all the special works of the last few decades.

He has fulfilled this task in the same manner in which he wrote his history of the kingdom of Jerusalem. He has given a careful and detailed account of all the important events. With a few exceptions the narrative is strictly chronological. It forms a vast repertory of facts with full references for almost every statement. In the notes, instead of citing at length all the sources, he has frequently economized space by referring to special works, such as Hagenmeyer's *Peter der Eremit*, with whose conclusions he agrees.

Naturally there is very little in the book that is new. It is, however, a thorough study of the whole subject; and sometimes Röhricht has added the weight of his opinion as to the decision of some disputed point. For example, he believes with Hagenmeyer that the Emperor Alexius did summon the crusaders; Chalandon, in his study of the reign of Alexius (Paris, 1900), and Diehl, in his essay in the *International Monthly* (June, 1902), deny this emphatically. The argument in this book has strengthened the position which Hagenmeyer and Röhricht

hold. It is interesting to note (pp. 57-58) that Röhricht makes the Emperor's change of heart, with regard to the desirability of aid from the west, date from the actions and fate of the disorderly bands which preceded the real armies. To sum up, this work is "a plain, unvarnished tale" of facts and is of interest only to students. For them it is invaluable, as the same information, with its fullness of bibliographical references, cannot be obtained anywhere else. For those who are familiar with Röhricht's work it is sufficient to say that this is marked by his well-known accuracy and wide research.

Of the four excurses, the first, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Kreuzzüge," had already been published in a *Programm* of the Humboldt Gymnasium. But, because of its usefulness, it is well to have it reprinted here in more accessible form. The second discusses Urban's speech at Clermont and gives an analysis of the accounts of the four principal authorities. In agreement with Hagenmeyer, Röhricht styles these four "Ohrenzeugen." Three of them certainly were, but neither Hagenmeyer nor Röhricht has given references which prove conclusively that the fourth was. The third excursus cites the passages relative to the *weisssagende Gänserich* which is said to have led certain bands of pilgrims. The fourth is the account of Antioch by Ibn Butlan, already published in English by Guy Le Strange. Three indexes of persons, places, and things, respectively, complete this admirable book.

DANA CARLETON MUNRO.

*The Evolution of the English Bible.* A historical sketch of the successive versions from 1382 to 1885. By H. W. Hoare. Second edition. (New York, E. P. Dutton and Co.; London, John Murray, 1902, pp. xxxii, 336.) That a second edition of this book should have been demanded within a year indicates a popular interest in the subject. The author considers the development and influence of the Bible in its various English translations as part of the national life. A graphic picture of the English Reformation is set before us and the story of the growth of the English Bible is told in a manner more acceptable to the general reader than it is in the more technical works. The volume contains several portraits, facsimiles from old Bibles, and a convenient chronology.

The obvious errors are few, but such a misprint as "1470," for "1477" (p. 118), referring to the introduction of printing into England by Caxton, should not have been overlooked in the revision. As an appendix, there has been added to this edition a three-page bibliography, which needs more of an apology than it receives in the preface. It was apparently slipped in as an afterthought without arrangement or verification. Quotation marks are hardly appropriate to titles which have been twisted from their original form, and such errors as "T. Wycliffe" for "John Wycliffe," "G. Lovett" for "Richard Lovett," and "Baxter's Hexapla" for "Bagster's Hexapla" are inexcusable. To furnish a good bibliography as well as an index with any serious work is an obligation due from the author to his subject and to his readers.

Even the most meager list of authorities should give the place as well as date of publication, and the title and description should be sufficient to identify the reference without question.

In this second edition, published in March, 1902, some mention might have been made of the American Revision, which appeared in August, 1901.

BYRON A. FINNEY.

*Florenz und die Mediceer*, by Professor D. Eduard Heyck (Bielefeld and Leipzig; Velhagen und Klasing, 1902, pp. 186), one of a series of *Monographien zur Weltgeschichte*, will be welcomed by those who wish to possess an admirable collection of Florentine pictures at a low price. The text does not aspire to originality; indeed, the book is recommended as "an illustrated guide and handbook for the city and its celebrated collections and galleries." The title of monograph in this connection, shows a widening use of the term, which may be brought eventually to cover such products of research as Baedeker.

M. W.

*The Medici and the Italian Renaissance*, by Oliphant Smeaton [World's Epoch Makers] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, pp. x, 286), is an informal and popular presentation of Florentine history, with such Roman additions as are justified by the migration of the younger Medici into the Curia. Among the pleasing features of the book is the evidence it affords of the increasing number of readers who are interesting themselves in the Renaissance. Attractive as that period unquestionably is, it is no easy task to treat it in a popular manner, and Mr. Smeaton has chosen the best method, in making the Medici the central figures of his book, grouping about them the lights of the age, artistic and literary, and subordinating the interplay of political forces, French, Spanish, and German, which could only serve to complicate hopelessly the subject.

M. W.

*Essai sur l'Origine de la Noblesse en France au Moyen Âge*. Par P. Guilhaumez. (Paris, Picard et Fils, 1902, pp. 502.) The author enters a field of discussion in which many battles have been fought. He realizes, apparently, that a new work must justify its existence, for he has fortified himself behind an extensive and elaborate bulwark of citations and references. In fact, the book is a model of logical arrangement and close reasoning upon a single topic in the history of feudal society, while at the same time the whole subject is reviewed in the light of present knowledge.

"La noblesse" is defined as a social class to which the law accords hereditary privileges on the ground of birth alone. The discussion confines itself to this class, disregarding any forms of aristocracy based on politics, wealth or influence. This privileged nobility of birth came to an end in the French Revolution. The firm establishment of the class is placed by the author in the twelfth century and he shows the process by which it was developed out of preceding conditions. He argues that the



hereditary nobility of the late Roman Empire did not furnish the basis of the medieval class, for its legal rights were suppressed by the Germans. Neither can the nobility of France be traced to a Germanic continuity, for no trace of an hereditary privileged class can be found in the laws of the Franks. Here is one of the most difficult points, for, in view of the existence of a nobility of birth among their neighbors, the Bavarians, the Saxons, the Frisians and the Angles it is hard to believe that an analogous class did not exist also among the Franks. Yet the line of development clearly shows that the later nobility was an outgrowth of chivalry. Chivalry, or the military service of royalty, was a fusion of two elements, the early servant vassals, and the free Franks. The legal position of these factors combined with honorable service eventually brought about class privilege based on descent. The author confines his work to the origins of nobility and does not attempt to treat of its later medieval history.

J. M. VINCENT.

*L'Église et les Origines de la Renaissance.* Par Jean Guiraud. (Paris, Lecoffre, 1902, pp. 339.) The present volume is one in a series of manuals of instruction in Church history now in course of publication. The series counts several of the best known names among Roman Catholic scholars, such as Mgr. Duchesne, Paul Allard and Imbart de la Tour. Its general purpose is to furnish something that shall be on a higher plane than the mere text-book and shall popularize the results of more elaborate treatises. This purpose is fairly answered in the work of M. Guiraud. His thesis is taken from the leaders of modern Roman Catholic historical writing, whenever they have had occasion to touch the subject of the Renaissance. It is that the Church, by which M. Guiraud understands the papacy, was among the great promoters of the intellectual and artistic movement which prepared the way for the Reformation. In support of this thesis he gives in a series of chapters, each devoted to one pope or a group of popes, a review of the scholars and artists who found their welcome at the papal court. He enumerates the buildings planned or carried out under papal auspices, the paintings used in their decoration, the literary works dedicated to popes or prepared at their suggestion. He draws his material from a wide range of good sources, and there is no serious question as to the essential accuracy of his statements. From this point of view, the array of trustworthy illustration, the volume is a worthy companion to its predecessors as a useful guide to students.

Our question must come on the bearing of all this on the real attitude of the Church towards the real Renaissance. If the Renaissance was nothing more than a sentiment of enthusiasm for antiquity, which resulted in the painting of better pictures and the writing of better Latin sonnets, then we might all agree that the Church as represented by the papacy was one of its most ardent supporters. As a worldly power among others the papacy had to keep up its court, build its buildings, maintain scholars as a part of its stage setting and all the rest of it.

But if the Renaissance was a true awakening of the spirit of inquiry, fearless of all consequences, then all this artistic activity was merely the superficial display that might or might not lead to something deeper. In encouraging this the Church was not taking one step along the road of real enlightenment, and the protest of the Reformation was the result. It is idle to defend the papacy of the fifteenth century as a friend of true enlightenment with the record of her history from Trent to the encyclicals of Leo XIII. before us. Whoever uses M. Guiraud's useful book must do so with the knowledge that the heart of the matter has not been touched.

A new edition of the *Mémoires de Philippe de Commines*, by B. de Mandrot, is appearing in the "Collection de Textes pour Servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire" (Paris, A. Picard et Fils). The first volume (1901, pp. 473) covers the years 1464-1477. The fact that the manuscript followed was not known to any preceding editor, together with the belief that it is the only one which contains the account of Charles VIII.'s expedition into Italy, is sufficient to make this edition of interest. For other reasons it will no doubt also be standard: the variants of other manuscripts and of the more important other editions are given; there are extensive notes, which seem to answer all relevant questions; an appropriate introduction is promised with the second volume; the page is attractive; and in general the book bears throughout the earmarks of well-done work.

E. W. D.

*Cromwell's Army. A History of the English Soldier During the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate.* By C. H. Firth. (London, Methuen and Co., 1902, pp. xii, 444.) The contents of this charming volume were first given to the public in the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1900-1901. It is the only adequate account of a very important subject; for it was during the Cromwell period that the old disjointed Tudor system of local trained bands, "who bore that name rather because they were selected for training than because they were actually trained," gave way to an efficient centralized army differing only in details from those of Marlborough and Wellington. Mr. Firth describes the new organization in detail, showing how it was officered, armed, clothed, fed and disciplined, how battles and sieges were conducted. There are two chapters on religion and politics in the army. It is seldom that one finds so much new information in an historical work. One should expect it to find favor in military circles; to the historian, at all events, it is indispensable. The author's information is drawn from an astonishing variety of sources, to which full references are given. Numerous extracts in the foot-notes and the appendix add greatly to the reader's interest.

G. J.

*A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time*, derived from his Original Memoirs, his Autobiography, his Letters to Admiral Herbert and his Private Meditations, all hitherto Unpublished. Edited by H. C.

Foxcroft. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1902, pp. lxiv, 565.) Bishop Burnet's *History of My Own Time*, like Lord Clarendon's *History of the Great Rebellion*, contains much valuable material for the history of the seventeenth century in England. The University Press at Oxford, which recently did good service to historical students in publishing a new and revised edition of Clarendon, has now undertaken a new edition of Burnet. The authorities of the library have entrusted the editing of Burnet to Mr. Osmund Airy, whose first two volumes covering the reign of Charles II. have now appeared. Somewhat unfortunately as it seems, before the new edition is completed, Miss Foxcroft has brought out what is practically an elaborate study of the text of Burnet. It would have been better to have allowed this most excellent piece of textual criticism to have been published as a supplement to Airy's edition of Burnet, rather than to have issued it at this time while the new edition is still in process of publication. Miss Foxcroft showed her efficiency as an historical scholar and made her reputation by her admirable life of the Marquis of Halifax, and in this volume she has proved her fitness as an editor and her skill in disentangling the curious history of the Burnet manuscripts. The importance of Burnet's work as material for history, despite his personal vanity and vehement partizanship, has been generally recognized, and Ranke's appendix on Burnet has hitherto been the best critical estimate of the importance of his writings. But Ranke, as Miss Foxcroft points out, was not thoroughly acquainted with the history of Bishop Burnet's revisions of his manuscript; a new estimate of the value of Burnet as material must be formed, when Airy's edition can be carefully reviewed in the light of Miss Foxcroft's critical work. It would be futile to criticize at any length this particular volume, but it may be as well to call the attention of students of English history to the fact that a new edition of Burnet is being published by the Clarendon Press and that when that edition takes its place among the standard materials for English history it should be studied in the light of Miss Foxcroft's *Supplement*.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

*Samuel de Champlain*. By Henry Dwight Sedgwick, Jr. [Riverside Biographical Series.] (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1902, pp. 126.) The publishers of the "Riverside Biographical Series" have done well in adding to their excellent collection, a life of Champlain, the first of the great governors and explorers of the north. Mr. Sedgwick, to whom the volume has been entrusted, has in an interesting but slightly florid style moulded it to win the attention of the young people for whom the series is designed. In doing so it has not been necessary to refer to original documents or to discuss at length questions of policy. His intimate acquaintance with the history of France during the seventeenth century has led him to dwell at more than usual length upon Champlain's life and surroundings in France, both before his departure and during the intervals of his return visits. He clearly discusses the movements and intrigues which ultimately afforded Champlain the long

looked for opportunities for the realization of his hopes of geographical discovery and conquest. From the lack of personal knowledge he fails to present Champlain's excursions into the unknown lands of the Great Lakes with that vivid reality which renders Parkman's narrative so enticing. Mr. Sedgwick does not follow Kingsford in seeing in Champlain's early and middle life traces of Huguenot training and practice, but throughout emphasizes facts which he thinks show him a faithful son of the Church. He bears the strongest testimony to his high moral character, his great prudence and self-sacrifice, and the noble example which he set in an age not remarkable for these qualities. It was the possession of these gifts by a man filled with the romance of exploration which makes Mr. Sedgwick rank him "as one of the worthiest, if not the worthiest man in the early history of North America." The use of the word "carries" where portage is intended is a localism, out of place and ungrammatical.

JAMES BAIN.

*When Old New York was Young.* By Charles Hemstreet. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. xi, 354.) This group of sketches is the work of one who has established a reputation in the study of New York antiquities. It traverses somewhat the same ground as his *Nooks and Corners of Old New York*, but is an improvement on the earlier book in style and arrangement. As an historical authority the present series of essays cannot take high rank, owing to the total absence of citations. This is not to say that the author's study of local records has been remiss; indeed such study is manifest throughout the pages. Manhattan Island for the last three hundred years is evidently an open book to Mr. Hemstreet.

The nature of the work may be inferred from the titles of the chapters. Some record the striking events of a locality, *e. g.*, "Greenwich Village and the Mouse-trap," "The Story of Chatham Square," "Around the Collect Pond," "The Pleasant Days of Cherry Hill." Others deal with the associations of certain institutions, *e. g.*, "Old-Time Theatres," "Christmas in Old New Amsterdam," "Town Markets from their Earliest Days," "Old-Fashioned Pleasure Gardens." While the writer's interests lie mainly in the lower end of the island, he has not neglected other regions, and we find chapters on "Kip's Bay and Kip's House," "Some Islands of the East River," and "Spring-Valley Farm." The illustrations, in part from old prints, in part somewhat idealized representations of former days, are less valuable than the sketch-maps which accompany the chapters. There is some needless repetition of incidents (*e. g.*, the story about the British frigate "Huzzar" is given on p. 146 and again on p. 221). But on the whole the book may be commended as a readable account of old New York.

EDMUND K. ALDEN.

The fifth volume of Blok's *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk* (Groningen, J. B. Wolters, 1902, pp. 494) deals with the second half

of the seventeenth century (1648-1702), confining itself now wholly to the Dutch, to the exclusion of their southern neighbors. Its two books call themselves respectively "The Republic in the Time of John DeWitt" and "William III." Discussion of the contents of the volume may well wait till Miss Putnam's translation shall make it more accessible to English readers. Suffice it now that, while trade, industry, religion, literature, art, domestic life, come in for much attention, it is political history, national and provincial, which takes still decidedly the leading place. There is the usual bibliography of sources; and the two maps appended to this volume show the changing boundaries of the Netherlands during this half-century and the sites of the naval encounters in the North Sea and the Channel.

*A Short History of the British in India.* By Arthur D. Innes. (London, Methuen and Co., 1902, pp. xxxii, 373.) In little books, brief summaries and essays, can alone be found the sort of information on Indian history, which the public as opposed to the historical student naturally craves. Macaulay's two famous essays on Clive and on Warren Hastings are almost the only pieces of general literature which have got into currency among general readers upon the history of India. They are fitly supplemented by the series of biographies published by the Clarendon Press at Oxford, under the title of "Rulers of India." As a consecutive history Hunter's *Brief History of the Indian Peoples* is a model of proportion, condensation and accuracy, but the large space given to the period before the arrival of the English makes it more suitable for a text-book in Indian schools, where it is largely used, than for general readers. Sir Alfred Lyall's *Rise of the British Dominion in India* is a most admirable essay and can be used effectively, as the present reviewer has more than once used it with classes in college. But it is essentially an essay, beautifully written and full of sound political wisdom, and it is not full enough of the latter period of the company's rule either for the general reader or for students. Mr. Innes has tried to fill this gap. He has tried to make a book longer than Sir Alfred Lyall's essay, and more entirely devoted to the history of the English conquerors than Sir W. Hunter's smaller book. He has had in his mind while writing the wishes of the general reader rather than the student. He has written a straightforward narrative without any pretension to the special charm of style of Lyall and of Hunter and without any idea of competing with larger works. He glides over controversies which might puzzle the English or American reader, and carefully abstains from foot-notes or references to authorities. His brief bibliography does not pretend to be exhaustive, and in that bibliography he makes no attempt to compare the value of the books to which he refers. Criticism of proportion means a different standpoint to the author's. But it should be pointed out that Mr. Innes deliberately abridges the beginning and end of his subject. He treats very cursorily the history of the company in India prior to the great war between the French and the English, and does not even mention the names of Sir Josiah Child, who foresaw the

future development of the company as a ruling power, or of Thomas Pitt, the stout old defender of Fort St. George at the beginning of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, Mr. Innes closes his history with the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, and has nothing to say of the new era of the direct government of India by the Crown. His book therefore is rather a history of the East India Company from Clive to 1857, than a history of the British in India. Forty-five years have passed since the Mutiny, and it is about time that writers on Indian history realized that much has occurred in India since the suppression of the East India Company. Nevertheless Mr. Innes's little book may meet the need of general readers who desire rather fuller information upon the later history of the company than they can obtain from Lyall's epoch-making essay on the *Rise of the British Dominion in India*. H. M. S.

*Stringer Lawrence, the Father of the Indian Army.* By Colonel J. Biddulph. (London, John Murray, 1901, pp. 133.) When Robert Clive, the heaven-born soldier, as William Pitt the elder once called him, was offered for his services in defeating the French army and making English power in India inevitable a sword of honor by the directors of the East India Company, he refused to accept it unless a similar sword was presented to his old commander, Stringer Lawrence. The directors saw the justice of the demand and voted to Lawrence a more valuable diamond-hilted sword than they had given to Clive. This incident shows the regard in which Clive held his old chief and justifies the ranking of Stringer Lawrence among the military heroes of the English in India. It is perhaps rather a large term to apply to Lawrence in calling him the father of the Indian army, but he certainly commanded a larger body of troops than previous English commanders had led, and he proved his powers of leadership in the famous siege of Trichinopoly, when the French cause in India finally went down. Colonel Biddulph has done well to draw attention to the services of this forgotten soldier, but he has added nothing to our knowledge of the history of the times in which he fought. The account of Lawrence's campaigns is mainly taken from Orme's *Contemporary History*, and no other source seems to have been drawn upon. The life of Captain Dalton, published some years ago, was of real historic value, and for the first time extracted from Orme's account the true inwardness from a military point of view of the failure of the French to take Trichinopoly. Colonel Biddulph does not seem to have had access to any new sources of information, and has simply worked up out of Orme the passages describing Lawrence's career. He has taken the trouble to look up the parentage of Stringer Lawrence, but he does not give much new biographical information. The little book is well got up and contains a map of the country round Trichinopoly, which illustrates the most famous feat of arms in which Stringer Lawrence was concerned. H. M. S.

*The Literature of American History.* A Bibliographical Guide in which the Scope, Character, and Comparative Worth of Books in Selected



Lists are set forth in Brief Notes by Critics of Authority. Edited for the American Library Association by J. N. Larned. (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1902, pp. ix, 588.) The character of this volume is truthfully presented in the sub-title. It is a book intended to be of use to the general reader in the library, and to librarians who are seeking advice on the purchase of books. But it is much more. There is no specialist in American history who cannot gather from its pages valuable knowledge and gain assistance in the prosecution of his work. The inception of the general plan is to be attributed to Mr. George Iles, who has been insisting for years upon the desirability of the evaluation of literature. "The trustees of literature," he said, in a paper written ten years ago, "will enter upon a doubled usefulness when they can set before the public not catalogues merely, but also a judicious discrimination of the more from the less valuable stores in their keeping." The generosity of Mr. Iles and the disinterested and unrequited services of Mr. Larned have made the plan a reality.

The volume contains six parts and an appendix. The first part is a syllabus of sources, arranged by Paul Leicester Ford, and a classified list of the most important documents and papers to be found in the publications of general historical societies. The second part deals with America at large; the third with the United States, the treatment being partly chronological, partly topical; the fourth with the United States by sections; the fifth with Canada; the sixth with Spanish and Portuguese America and the West Indies. The appendix, prepared by Professor Channing, is given up to suggestions to readers of history and to selected lists of books for school libraries and small public libraries.

The annotations or appraisals of the volumes, of which there are over 4,100 titles, seem to have been made conscientiously by men who have handled the material and know what they are talking about. Though different ideas as to the purposes and probable uses of the volume apparently prevailed, the comments in nearly all instances are of value. Most of the commentators probably had in mind the comparatively untrained reader in the library, who might wish to know the character of a book in question, its general trustworthiness, whether or not it was well written and interesting or dull. The object of the work was not to add technical bibliographical information for experts or for special investigators. Not for invidious comparison, but to indicate the great value of the book, attention may be called to the sharp, crisp criticisms by Professor Channing on books of the Revolutionary period, to the helpful bibliography of education prepared and appraised by Burke A. Hinsdale, and to the Civil War books which are to a great extent commented upon by General Cox. In quite a number of cases, notes of evaluation are taken from a critical journal or from Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History*. Appraisals thus obtained often seem hardly so well adapted to the purpose of the volume as are those that have been specially prepared, but they have on the whole been well chosen and will prove useful. The special student will be apt to dis-

agree occasionally in some slight degree with the annotations ; but very little in the nature of error has been discovered by the reviewer. There seems, however, no reason for the appraisal of Warfield's *Kentucky Resolutions* in two different places ; on page 304, Toppan is spelled "Tappan" ; attention should certainly have been called to the later edition of Adams's *Manual of Historical Literature* ; no mention is made of Professor Turner's paper on the significance of the frontier, though one or two others, less important, by the same author are named ; the note under *Bulletins of the University of Wisconsin* is unsatisfactory. Such slight errors can be corrected, and perhaps the list somewhat revised in a new edition. The student of American history is too grateful for the able and conscientious work of Mr. Larned to be captious and hypercritical.

The lists include but few of the books that have come from the press since 1899. Arrangements have been made for a continuation of the work from year to year under the editorship of Mr. Philip P. Wells, librarian of the Yale Law School. A supplement in pamphlet form covering the years 1900 and 1901 is expected to appear soon. The index is ample and, as far as a somewhat careful examination discloses, has been made with accuracy, intelligence and skill.

The second volume, seventh series, of the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1902, pp. xvi, 491) contains the third installment of the papers of Jonathan Trumbull. They include letters and other documents, of the Revolutionary time, the earliest dated February, 1776, the latest July, 1779. The earlier documents of this period were printed in Force's *American Archives* and are not reproduced here. It is needless to comment on the great value of the material to a student of the war. The volume is crowded with interesting and significant letters. Among the most noteworthy are those written during Burgoyne's invasion ; they admirably illustrate the confusion and flurry of the time. Schuyler was pleading with Trumbull for troops ; Trumbull seemed to think he knew something about the situation himself ; letters from his son who was with the northern army and complained bitterly of the masterly inactivity of the commanders seem to have influenced him quite as much as the communications from the much abused Schuyler ; conflicting letters and requisitions for troops flowed in to the governor to increase the confusion ; and the militia, when sent for service, often acted as if they had gone for the excursion, not to fight. Schuyler in describing his forces to Trumbull gives a strong statement of his difficulties : " Militia from the State of Connecticut,—one Major, one Captain, two Lieutenants, two Ensigns, one Adjutant, one Quartermaster, six Serjeants, one Drummer, six sick, and three rank and file fit for duty, the rest, after remaining three or four days, deserted us " (p. 91). There are likewise some interesting letters giving accounts of the campaign in Pennsylvania the same year, 1777. It would be difficult, in fact, to find a more valuable single volume throwing light on the military and political incidents of the time.

*Israel Putnam : Pioneer, Ranger, and Major-General, 1718-1790.* By William Farrand Livingston. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901, pp. xviii, 442.) The author of this biography in "The American Men of Energy" series has done a careful and painstaking piece of work, and in spite of the number of lives and sketches of this heroic character already published, has found some new sources of information, including a number of Putnam's letters and official reports; and these serve in part at least as a justification for the appearance of this book. The author has read widely in his diligent and successful search for facts, and has found abundant material for a stirring and interesting narrative. Further he has been successful in putting his material together in such a way as to make a readable book, though not one that will add much to our information in the way of a critical estimate of Putnam as a strategist and leader of men.

The author traces Putnam's tireless and active career from boyhood to old age and divides the book about equally between the periods of his life prior to and subsequent to the Battle of Bunker Hill. Much interesting anecdote is mentioned concerning Putnam, including the wolf hunt at Pomfret and the famous ride down the rocky height at Horse-neck; and his unique experiences as ranger and Indian fighter are detailed; all of which contribute information concerning the bravery, generosity, energy, and impetuosity of this heroic character and serve to account for his later pre-eminence in the war of the American Revolution. It is in the first half of the book that the reader will doubtless find his greatest interest.

One of the longest chapters is devoted to the Bunker Hill fight and Putnam is given the credit of the real leadership in this battle. The author would have added greatly to his account of this event by including a plan or map of the battle-ground. Putnam's service in the American Revolution is treated with fullness. He is defended against blame for the defeat at Long Island, and the reasons for his supersession in command of the Hudson Highlands are explained. Though his conduct was not above question, Putnam was exonerated from blame for the Hudson disaster by a court of inquiry, whose decision was approved by the Continental Congress.

The book is filled with extracts and quotations from authorities used, which for the most part are pertinent and interesting; but the author makes the mistake of interrupting his narrative too frequently in this way, and gives it too much the appearance of a collection of excerpts. Some of this matter should have been condensed, and much of it might better have been committed to the foot-notes and appendixes.

We note but few errors. There is a misprint in the date of B. F. Stevens's *Facsimiles or Manuscripts*, on page xvii. While the author is very careful to indicate his sources, there is an occasional failure to give the complete reference as in the third note on page 177. The publishers have produced an attractive book. The typography is good and the work is profusely illustrated with historical views, portraits, and memorials

of Putnam, and facsimiles of his letters. A bibliography of the principal works cited is also included.  
J. WILLIAM BLACK.

*Nathan Hale, the Ideal Patriot. A Study of Character.* With Views of the Author's Statue of Nathan Hale; Portraits of Hale's Contemporaries and of Kindred Characters; also three Drawings by W. R. Leigh together with an Introduction by George Cary Eggleston. By William Ordway Partridge. (New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1902, pp. 134.) This volume is a bombastic eulogy of the pyrotechnic newspaper or fourth-of-July order. The data are almost entirely drawn from Stuart's *Life of Hale*, 1856, and the numerous errors of that work are perpetuated, to which Mr. Partridge has added a medley of others wrought wholly out of his own imagination. Mr. Partridge has, of course, his own pretensions (pp. 13 and 14), but Mr. Eggleston is certainly not justified in saying in his "Foreword" (p. 27), that "Mr. Partridge has studied the character, the purposes, and the personality of Nathan Hale as no other man has done since that patriot of the Revolution . . . sacrificed his life," etc. But to state the truth, it would take a larger volume than Mr. Partridge has produced, to point out his errors and give the valuable facts which he does not mention.

Dwight was not President of Yale when Hale entered (p. 46); there is not the slightest evidence that Hale marched to Lexington (p. 51); there is also no evidence of the interviews with Washington, as stated on page 52 and other pages; his account of Hale's courtship is a mesh-work of fable; "Ansel Wright" (p. 69) should be Asher Wright; the repetition of Stuart's fiction about Hale's capture at Huntington, Long Island, and the tavern of a widow Chichester, is unsupported by any evidence (pp. 72 and 73); the same is true of everything stated about Cunningham (p. 82); and with the circumstantial and other evidence easily accessible, a schoolboy would not have hung Hale in Chambers Street, in a graveyard (p. 84). These are but a few out of a mass of absurdities, which appear in this freak among American biographies.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

At length an edition of the writings of Mameli has appeared worthy of the beautiful memory of this soldier-poet, the Tyrtæus of modern Italy. It is entitled *Scritti Editi ed Inediti di Goffredo Mameli, ordinati e pubblicati con Proemio, Note, e Appendici a Cura di Anton Giulio Barrili* (Genoa, Società Ligure di Storia Patria, 1902) and includes—beside the poetry of Mameli and nine of his letters—his political writings, originally published in the journals of Genoa and Rome and known to-day to few of his admirers. The edition of Mameli's writings of Genoa, 1850, the only preceding edition which contained his prose, has long been out of print, and has become very rare. Many of the writings of the new edition of 1902 are here published for the first time; of the other writings many have been re-edited from the original manu-

scripts. The preface by the noted Italian writer, Barrili, is excellent, as also are the appendixes, which deal with different episodes of the soldier-poet's life and include unedited letters and an unedited sketch from the pen of Garibaldi. The prefaces to earlier editions, by Guiseppe Mazzini, and by M. G. Canale are reprinted here in full, together with an important extract from Manegazzi's interesting and rare pamphlet, *Sulla Morte di Goffredo Mameli* (Foligno, 1891). The volume has an additional interest for the bibliophile in the numerous photographic facsimiles of Mameli's manuscripts which it contains. HARRY NELSON GAY.

A new edition of *Richardson's War of 1812* with notes and a life of the author by Alexander Clark Casselman has been published. (Toronto, Historical Publishing Co., 1902.) Richardson took an active part in the war in the west, and his narrative which was first published in 1842 is of considerable value to the student. The new edition contains a biography of Richardson, maps and plans of battles, foot-notes in explanation of the text. The editor has left the body of the work unaltered, but says that he has felt free to put in perfect copies of official despatches which in the original edition were abbreviated or incorrectly transcribed.

*The Life of the Right Hon. Sir William Molesworth, Bart.*, by Mrs. Fawcett (Macmillan, 1901, pp. 352) recounts the service of a man who labored for the development of the colonial empire of Great Britain in a time of despondency when the colonies were often discontented, and who struggled in Parliament for wiser legislation and for fuller appreciation of imperial possibilities and responsibilities. His work may be summed up in the words chosen from a letter of Bright to Cobden, 1857: "Look at our Colonial policy. Through the labours of Molesworth, Roebuck, and Hume, more recently supported by us and by Gladstone, every article in the creed which directed our Colonial policy has been abandoned, and now men actually abhor the notion of undertaking the government of the Colonies; on the contrary, they give to every Colony which asks for it, a constitution as democratic as that which exists in the United States." He was a member of the "Philosophical Radicals," a party reduced at one time, if we may believe Macaulay, as we probably cannot, to "Grote and his wife"; he was one of the founders of the Reform Club and of the *London Review*. For the abolishment of the transportation system he worked with eager persistence; at his instance a select committee was chosen in 1837 to inquire into the system and discover how far it was susceptible of improvement. Molesworth was chairman of the committee and wrote, it seems, a large part of the report, disclosing the loathsome details of a revolting practice. Although transportation of criminals was not altogether given up until some years after Molesworth's death, his efforts did not go for naught. The volume is pleasantly written, contains a number of interesting letters which help to throw light on the politics of the first half of the last century, and while it seems uncritical and over-enthusiastic will be useful in a study of the development of the colonial policy of Britain.

*Daniel Webster.* By Samuel McCall. (Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1902, pp. 124.) This little volume gives us, in book form, the "Webster Centennial Oration" delivered by Mr. McCall at Dartmouth in September, 1901. It is not another *Life of Webster*, but is, rather, an appreciation. The author endeavors to set before us "some estimate of Webster as a lawyer, an orator, and a statesman," and to recall "some of the great principles of government with which he was identified."

The book is not of the sort that one would consult for accurate information. It is eulogistic and argumentative—admirably suited to the occasion upon which it was delivered. The nature of Webster's education and the sources of his style are discussed. He is compared with his contemporaries and other statesmen in English history. The possibility of comparing him with Demosthenes and Cicero is denied. In treating Webster's connection with the Dartmouth college case, the author adheres—as was fitting to the occasion—to the old sentimental idea that Webster's love for his Alma Mater led him to take a passionate interest in the success of the college. He failed to note the letter in the Private Correspondence of Webster, showing that, when the quarrel between the college authorities and its enemies began, Webster was only solicitous to get into the case on *one* side or the *other*. The "Seventh of March" speech is ably defended. The political situation is reviewed, and attention called to the fact that Clay and Calhoun both regarded the time as critical. Webster, says the author, threw away his chance for the presidency by that speech. There are letters of Webster, extant, which show that he himself expected such a result. The defense of his speech is well worth the attention of those who hold that it is a stain on Webster's career.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

*The Overland Stage to California* by Frank A. Root and William Elsey Connelley (Topeka, Kansas, published by the authors, 1901) is a somewhat entertaining medley of personal reminiscences, border tales, and historical narrative illustrated by absurd pictures that are far from an ornament to the text. Like other books of this kind it has its obvious defects; but it is not without interest and is evidently the result of great labor and of painstaking effort to get information. Mr. Root was an express messenger in early days, and such recollections of the rough life of forty years ago as he has given constitute the best part of the book, which is likely to prove of some service to the historian who is endeavoring to recreate the western movement.

The volume *Il Generale Giuseppe Govone. Frammenti di Memorie* (Turin, Casanova, 1902), written by Ulberto Govone, son of the general, is of considerable interest for the general history of Italy, in view of the variety of important services rendered by Govone during the period 1848-1870. It is made up in part of his autobiographical memoir and of extracts from his letters. Relative to the important diplomatic mis-



sions fulfilled by Govone in 1866, it may be added that this volume would have aroused more interest had Chiala's *Ancora un po' piu di Luce* not appeared a few weeks in advance of it, containing many of Govone's unedited despatches, and revealing all that is of interest.

H. N. G.

*Memorials of William Charles Lake, Dean of Durham 1869-1894.*

Edited by his widow, Katharine Lake, with a Preface by George Rawlinson, Canon of Canterbury. (London, Edward Arnold, 1901, pp. xxii, 342.) Dean Lake was a good if not a great man. He lived in an eventful time and numbered among his most intimate friends those who were both good and great. His biography, however, does little more than confirm what we know already of the period and of its chief characters. The book presents quite a variety of contents. The introduction includes a biographical preface by Canon Rawlinson, an editorial notice by Mrs. Lake and a letter from Archbishop Temple. The main work is divided into three parts. The first part contains the beginnings of an unfinished autobiography, covering the Dean's early life down to 1856, and concluding with a chapter on Archbishop Tait. The second part is an appreciative outline of Dr. Lake's work as warden of the university and dean of the cathedral of Durham. The third part consists of nearly two hundred pages of correspondence, mostly short letters or extracts from Archbishop Tait, Dean Church, Dean Stanley, Mr. Gladstone, Canon Liddon, Dr. Pusey, Lord Halifax and others, but most disappointing as containing little more than personal allusions, or what has been already published. Indeed much of what would otherwise be the most important part of the material of which the book is made up, has been published in the various lives and histories of the principal characters and events which already have been issued. The book concludes with a short appendix containing a sketch of the history of the Durham School of Science at Newcastle written by the principal, the Rev. H. P. Gurney. A very full index to the whole work is added.

As has been said the book adds little to our knowledge of the great historical events with which the times were filled. We have very few of the Dean's own letters, and the letters he received from really great men throw little light on great events for they are too personal to be of much historical value. The most remarkable and impressive thing is that a dean of one of the greatest cathedrals in England, an extreme high churchman, should receive his greatest glory for having practically founded and brought to a high state of efficiency a thoroughly modern school of science. In a foot-note a quotation is given from the *Newcastle Chronicle* for October 9, 1894. "Literally Dean Lake has transformed the higher educational life of the North and figuratively he may be said to have found us with a small university of brick and to be leaving us with a great university of marble."

C. L. W.

*Die Deutsche Einigungswerk im Lichte des Amerikanischen.* Von Albert von Ruville. (Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1902, pp. 128.) In this interesting essay the author compares the processes of unification in America, 1776-1865, and Germany, 1815-1871, paying attention only to the actual political force involved, whether physical or mental and whether found with prince, leader or people. He ignores legal and constitutional forms, and, dismissing in a sentence "den unmöglichen Bundesstaatsbegriff," considers both the United States and the German Empire as unitary states, the one republican, the other monarchical. The purpose of the comparison is to show that the United States stands as a triumph of unionist over separatist tendencies; whereas the present Empire, instead of being the goal of German evolution and the consummation of national destiny, is a product of victorious secession and Prussian particularism. This difference is due to the fact that American statesmen recognized existing political forces in their constitutions and thus achieved and maintained unity, while Austrian and Prussian leaders by refusing to do likewise and establish a dual control ended by dividing the historic German race. In spite of its material success, says the author, the Empire can never stand justified before the judgment of history until it has sought and attained union with Austria. It should announce this as its policy for the future.

The author's treatment of things American is generally appreciative and sometimes laudatory, especially where a moral can be pointed at the expense of Stein, Bismarck and other "Preussisch-dynastisch" statesmen. Occasionally this is carried to an extreme, as when for example the United States is represented as having attained a complete national, territorial race unity in the sense urged for Germany,—a position hardly to be maintained as long as Canada exists. If Austria is necessary to a real Germany, Canada is equally so to a real United States.

The only point where the essay fails in any striking way to do justice to the United States is in regard to the Monroe doctrine which is condemned as having no historical basis and asserting claims which "*nur auf die zufällige Namensgleichheit zweier Kontinente gründen.*" Comment on the absurdity of the italicized phrase is unnecessary. Apart from this lapse, however, the essay is careful, thoughtful and suggestive.

T. C. S.

*Thirty Years in Washington, or Life and Scenes in our National Capital.* Edited by Mrs. John A. Logan. (Hartford, Connecticut, A. S. Worthington and Co., 1901, pp. xxxii, 752.) Those persons to whom *Thirty Years in Washington*, edited by Mrs. John A. Logan, shall come in the regular course of the subscription book trade will find the volume replete with that particular kind of information most relished by visitors to the capital city — curious facts, statistics of all sorts, anecdotes of persons, and incidents connected with the various places described. In the course of the century since the permanent seat of government was established in the District of Columbia a large amount of tradition has

accumulated; but unfortunately accurate information is scanty. As a result errors are handed down from one popular writer to another; and the historical and the critical spirit have alike been wanting. For example, the history of many of the portraits and ornaments of value in the White House has been lost; and it was not until the publication of Glenn Brown's *History of the United States Capitol*, in 1901, that the credit for the original plans of that building was proved to belong to Thornton, and the Congressional Directory was corrected accordingly.

Some of the errors in Mrs. Logan's book are due to the unreliability of tradition. For example, there is no truth in the statement (p. 133) that the White House is a copy of the Duke of Leinster's Dublin residence. There are historical errors, such as are contained in the statement (p. 34) that Braddock's troops were encamped on the site of the old naval observatory and that Washington was with them as a captain of Virginia militia. Again, L'Enfant was dismissed not because he was an unappreciated genius; but because his refusal to furnish a copy of his map of the city of Washington threatened to defeat the project of selling lots and thereby realizing the money necessary for the construction of the public buildings. Also there is no foundation for the tradition (p. 69) that land speculation forced the development of the city of Washington westward rather than eastward from the Capitol; the fact being that the location of the White House fixed the social center, as the location of the departmental buildings largely determined the placing of the residences.

There are also unaccountable errors of fact. Senators do not (p. 87) draw seats by lot at the beginning of each session. On the contrary, they file with one of the assistant doorkeepers a secret request for a seat likely to be vacated by reason of the failure to return on the part of the senator occupying the coveted place, a custom which tends both to relegate new senators to the least desirable seats, and also on occasion to allow an interesting gamble on the re-election of a particular senator. Mrs. Logan indorses (p. 115) the prevalent error that there is practically as well as theoretically unlimited debate in the Senate; whereas Senator Gorman's statement is the correct one: a united majority can always reach a vote after reasonable debate. Generally speaking, there is shown in the book nothing beyond a surface acquaintance with the ways of Congress and of administrations; and after a perusal of its 750 pages one would suppose that good luck, overruling incapacity and ignorance, were the factors in the administration of the affairs of this intricate, complicated, costly, widely diversified, and extremely comprehensive government. The most interesting and valuable chapters are those in which Mrs. Logan, from the point of view of an interested participant, gives the impressions of the social-political life of Washington.

CHARLES MOORE.

*Sir William White, G.C.B., K.C.M.G.* For six years Ambassador at Constantinople. His Life and Correspondence. By H. Suth-

erland Edwards. (London, John Murray, 1902, pp. vii, 284.) One cannot visit in the diplomatic circle at Constantinople without hearing three British ministers lauded as conspicuous above all the other representatives of England at the court of the Sultan. The three are Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Earl Dufferin, and Sir William White. The career of the last named minister is less familiar to most of us than the achievements of his two great predecessors. We therefore looked with much interest for the biography of him by Mr. H. Sutherland Edwards.

His father held important posts in the British consular and colonial service. His maternal grandfather was British Envoy Extraordinary to Poland. He himself was born in Poland and spent a large part of his young manhood in that country. In 1857 at the age of thirty-three he became a clerk in the office of the British Consul at Warsaw. In 1861 he was promoted to the consulship at Dantzic, in 1876 he was sent to Belgrade as Consul General, in 1878 to Bucharest without formal credentials, but later in 1880 with the rank of Envoy Extraordinary when England recognized Prince Charles I. of Roumania, in 1885 to Constantinople as Ambassador *ad interim*, and in 1886 he received the permanent appointment to that position and held it till his death in 1891.

He had therefore extraordinary opportunities for becoming familiar with the tongues, the history and the character of the peoples of eastern Europe. His official career covered a period of most important events, the final suppression of Polish insurrection by Russia, the varying fortunes of the Balkan states during the last forty years, the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, the San Stefano and the Berlin Treaties, the innumerable diplomatic discussions which those treaties caused, and the friction between Russian and English policies in Turkey between 1885 and 1891.

Now the biographer throughout his volume gives us to understand, and no doubt justly, that Sir William White by his able reports to his government and by his diplomatic skill played an important part in these affairs. But the remarkable and unfortunate fact is that he does not inform us exactly what Sir William did. He fills his book with a history, not always sequent and lucid, of the march of events in the east. He even gives us numerous interesting letters from Sir Robert Morier, Lord Odo Russell and others to White, but scarcely any letters of White on public affairs. He tells us that White made valuable reports to the British foreign office, but gives us hardly any passages from those reports. We have numerous *bons mots* and repartees of Bismarck and others, but too few words of White. We search in vain in the very complicated story of the changes in the Balkan states and of the troubles in Turkey for a precise answer to the questions, what did White really do, and how did he accomplish it? What is the basis for his high reputation in the east? The author has in fact given us a somewhat desultory sketch of the vicissitudes of the Balkan states rather than an illuminating and satisfactory history of Sir William White's diplomatic career.

J. B. A.

*Leopold von Ranke's Bildungsjahre und Geschichtsauffassung.* Von Dr. Wahan Nalbandian. (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1902, pp. viii, 103.) This recent addition to the "Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte" is an excellent example of methodical historiography. The sketch of Ranke's earlier life, of the formative influences to which he was subject, and of the development of his historical interests is very carefully done from a close study of the autobiographical fragments and correspondence. For the second part, in which the topics are Ranke's doctrine of guiding principles or ruling ideas (*leitenden Ideen*), his views on freedom and necessity, on progress and the ultimate goal (*Ziel*), Nalbandian draws mainly upon Ranke's latest utterances in the *Weltgeschichte*. So careful an analysis of Ranke's philosophy of history makes one regret that the author did not attempt an equally conscientious examination of his method as an investigator and of his significance and influence as a teacher. Even without these essentials to a complete study of Ranke as an historian, this essay may be pronounced one of the best introductions to Ranke's writings that is available. It will be more useful to the student than Guglia's *Life*, excellent as that is, because of the greater number and precision of its references to Ranke's works, and it is more trustworthy than Guillard's specious essay, which is deficient in impartiality and disfigured by garbled quotations. Interesting and instructive in itself, Nalbandian's dissertation acquires additional interest and significance as the work of a young Armenian scholar.

E. G. B.

The fifteenth volume of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, second series, covers the proceedings of the meetings from March, 1901, to February, 1902, inclusive. Among the more important papers are "The Genesis of the Monroe Doctrine," by Worthington C. Ford, which includes, with some comment, much of the material used by Mr. Ford in preparing the articles for the REVIEW on that subject; a paper by Charles Francis Adams, president of the society, on "John Quincy Adams and Martial Law," to which reference has already been made in the pages of this journal; a valuable article with much documentary material, also contributed by Mr. Ford, on the conflict between the governor and council of Massachusetts on the death of Queen Anne. Mr. Ford also presents a series of letters from Joseph Jones to James Madison. They were written during the years 1788 to 1802, and refer to many of the more significant political movements and theories of the day. A few words from a letter of December, 1792, are worth quoting here as an illustration of how difficult—Mr. Ford says "impossible"—it was for a Virginian to grasp the meaning of Hamilton's reports. "The Secretary's plan of a sinking fund I have read over but do not yet comprehend. It is intricate and so complicated it appears to one to require some time and attention to understand. At first view I think it well calculated to keep us all in the dark excepting those near the seat of government, where the finances are better understood than with us, and

who thrive on speculation" (p. 140). Samuel A. Green communicates two interesting narratives of the expedition of Sir William Phips against Canada. The originals of these narratives are in the Lenox Library. One of them was written by Mr. John Wise to Increase Mather, the other is anonymous.

*The American Federal State.* By Roscoe Lewis Ashley. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1902, pp. xlv, 599.) This work is intended as a text-book on politics for high schools and academies; and is a much more comprehensive treatment than the conventional books on civil government. After an introductory chapter of general definitions, there are three parts—Historical Development, Government, and Policies and Problems. The first section is too brief to take the place of a history text-book; yet it necessarily covers the same ground somewhat superficially. Probably it would be a better plan to discuss such historical facts as are necessary under the various topics and institutions. The second section includes national, state and local governments, with some attention to the usually neglected administrative authorities. The last section has a miscellaneous collection of chapters on suffrage and elections, the political party, constitutional and legal rights, taxation, money, trade and industry, foreign affairs and colonies, and the duties of citizenship. Appendixes contain the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, and valuable tables summarizing the most important facts of state government.

Mr. Ashley increases the value of his book by some critical discussion, in which he finds more to commend than to condemn in our institutions and their working. But he cannot be compared with Mr. Bryce as a philosophical essayist. Moreover, he does not always appreciate salient facts, and in details is sometimes inaccurate. Thus he describes the English Revolution of 1689 without mentioning the Bill of Rights or the Parliamentary transfer of the Crown. His accounts of the development of bicameral legislatures and the events leading up to the Civil War are wrong in several respects. He fails to explain the undue influence of the "pivotal states" in the election of President. He discusses the judicial veto on unconstitutional legislation as if it were specifically granted in the Constitution. City charters were never granted by state governors. Municipal franchises do not give the right to supply water or gas, but the privilege of using the public streets.

A text book should be a model of good English; and in this respect the work needs serious revision. Split infinitives, "civics," "quite" (meaning rather), "etc.," and other uncouth words and phrases abound.

In addition to the text, there are suggestions for teachers, excellent bibliographies preceding each chapter, and questions and references for further investigation, all of which add much to the usefulness of the book for schools. There is, however, no mention of three very important works: Greene's *Provincial Governor*, Chambrun's *Le Pouvoir Exécutif aux États Unis*, and Dunbar's *Chapters on Banking*. J. A. F.



The eminent Berlin publishing firm of Reimer have issued this year a work which they propose as an annual publication: *Deutschland und die Grosse Politik anno 1901*, von Dr. Th. Schiemann, Professor an der Universität Berlin; Berlin, 1902. The author is Theodore Schiemann, a professor of history at the Berlin University and the author of several authoritative works on Russia. Under the auspices of such a publisher, with such a title and with the name of a professor of history as author, we had hoped that the work would be a calm historic review of the past year—valuable to students of history and particularly to public men.

Professor Schiemann is a disciple of Treitschke and honest so far as he can see. But unfortunately he is dealing with many questions about which his knowledge is imperfect; he has obviously travelled little and his opinions are tainted by the vulgar prejudice that characterizes a certain portion of the German press of to-day. A more impartial author might make the successive volumes of this work a credit to German scholarship if he would but visit some other countries—notably the United States and a few English colonies. At present the work reads like a gospel of hatred. The author sees in every country naught but intrigues against Germany. His mouth is full of Jingo phrases such as the “national honor and the historic mission for which Providence has destined us.” He sees in every move of England and the United States, to say nothing of Russia and France, a menace to Germany. He urges the strengthening of the German navy, in order to make it impossible that his country should again have to suffer what she did at Manila in 1898! (375). He refers to the “insults” hurled at the Kaiser after his despatch to Paul Krüger in 1896, but does not specify the persons guilty of such behavior—he will have grave difficulty in substantiating this statement. He shows deplorable ignorance of things in England and the United States—for instance he confuses the government of Roosevelt with that of Croker (374), shows (on p. 35) that he has never heard of such a thing in America as a “standing army.” He refers to Americans contemptuously as “Yankees.” Much of the book is made up of alleged cruelties practiced by British against Boers, and his prophesies in regard to that struggle have been already proved false. He prays for the humiliation of England in South Africa, and urges Germany to intervene on behalf of the Boers as a political measure.

The idea of this book is excellent, and we hope that it will not be allowed to lapse merely on account of the present blemishes. The volume just issued contains some 430 pages. Half of these could well have been suppressed, for they represent opinions of no value, or worse than none. In the next issue we venture to suggest that under “Grosse Politik” the editor might well include something more than merely speculative intrigues on the part of cabinet officers or a recapitulation of jingo newspaper articles.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

*Archæological History of Ohio. The Mound Builders and Later Indians.* By Gerard Fowke. (Columbus, Ohio State Archæological

and Historical Society, 1902.) The title of this book is rather misleading, since it is purely archaeological in character, dealing with mounds and other relics and not at all with historical events, even when it is concerned with Indian tribes of recent times. Nevertheless the book has historical value of a negative character, since the author devotes the greater part of the first twelve chapters to destructive criticism of exaggerated theories and unsupported assertions about a mysterious vanished race of civilized "mound builders." On the constructive side the book contains practically nothing. The writer rather inclines to believe that the hilltop forts were built by an invading race, the valley works by a settled one, but he avoids committing himself definitely. "We have no data," he says in conclusion, "from which can be determined what people built these mounds and enclosures, whence they came, how long they lived here, when or why they left, or whether they left at all, whether they were exterminated by other tribes or faded away from natural causes, or what finally became of them. . . . But we have abundant reason for asserting that in no particular were they superior to or in advance of many of the known Indian tribes."

The author's real independence of view, cautiousness as to opinions and willingness to differ from other writers is somewhat obscured by a mass of quotations which make the book look upon cursory examination like a mere compilation. It is in reality much more than that, and, with the exception of one chapter, where the author discards his caution and enters upon a thoroughgoing defense of the Indian race from any and all criticisms passed upon it, ought to be considered a necessary preliminary to any future history of Ohio. It clears the way.

T. C. S.

## NOTES AND NEWS

Charles Kendall Adams, a member of the council of the American Historical Association and a well-known historical scholar, died at his home in Redlands, California, July 26. Mr. Adams was born in Derby, Vermont, in 1835. In the autumn of 1857 he entered the University of Michigan and received the bachelor's degree four years later. The next year he was appointed instructor in history and Latin in the University of Michigan. From 1867 to 1885 he was professor of history at Michigan, resigning to accept the presidency of Cornell University. The latter position he held till 1892, when he became president of the University of Wisconsin. Because of failing health he found it necessary, about a year ago, to give up his academic work. His work as a teacher of history first gave him reputation and standing in the country at large. As a student in Germany thirty years since, he became interested in German methods of instruction, and helped to introduce into our universities the more modern methods of conducting historical study and investigation. President Adams was not a prolific writer. His best known work is the *Manual of Historical Literature* (1889) which is certainly a monument of patient toil. He was also the author of *Democracy and Monarchy in France From the Inception of the Revolution to the Overthrow of the Second Empire* (1872); *Christopher Columbus, his Life and his Work* (1892). He edited *Representative British Orations* (1884), and was the editor in chief of the *Universal Encyclopædia* (1896).

We are called on to chronicle the death of another American historian and likewise an ex-president of the American Historical Association. Mr. Edward Eggleston died at Thomasville, Georgia, September 2. Born in Indiana in 1837, he was chiefly educated in the country schools of that state. In 1857 he entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and served in Indiana and Minnesota. For some years after 1866 he was mostly engaged in editorial work, being for a time editor of the *Independent*. His earlier literary work was in the field of fiction, as the author of clever character studies like *The Hoosier Schoolmaster* and *The Circuit Rider*. One may indeed attribute to such works as these something of historical value and interest, for they describe with strength, humor and insight the life and activities of the Indiana of forty years ago. In later years he devoted his attention almost exclusively to historical writing, publishing successively *History of the United States and its People, for the Use of Schools* (1888); *Household History of the United States and its People* (1888); *First Book in American History* (1889), and also other smaller texts for school classes. His most important con-

tributions to historical literature are *The Beginners of a Nation* (1896), which is a charming narrative of parts of our early colonial history, and *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century* (1901). These two volumes were to constitute portions of what the author called "A History of Life in the United States"—portions of a task for which Dr. Eggleston's studies and talents specially fitted him, but which he has not lived to accomplish.

The interests of Southwestern history have sustained a sad loss in the death of Dr. Lester G. Bugbee, which occurred on March 17. Though not quite thirty-three years old he had already accomplished much. His most important writings are articles on *The Old Three Hundred* (in the Texas Historical Association Quarterly, I.); *The Real Saint-Denis* (ibid.); *What became of the Lively* (ibid.); *Some Difficulties of a Texas Empresario* (Publications of the Southern History Association, April, 1899); *The Texas Frontier, 1820-1825* (idem, March, 1900); *The Archives of Bexar* (Texas University Record, October, 1899); *Slavery in Early Texas* (Political Science Quarterly, XIII.); and also he had completed the larger part of a life of Stephen F. Austin. With all of these Dr. Bugbee was a specially effective and popular teacher. His work at the University of Texas, where he was adjunct professor of history, will not soon be forgotten.

Lord Acton, after a year's illness, died June 19, at Tegernsee in Bavaria. Born in 1834, member of Parliament from 1859 to 1865, peer from 1869, lord in waiting to the Queen from 1892 to 1895, adviser of Gladstone, profound lay Catholic theologian and leader against ultramontanes, and in these latter years professor of history at Cambridge, he most impressed his fellowmen as a scholar. Withal he wrote little; an article on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, another on the German schools of history, the well-known inaugural lecture, and the introduction to Burd's *Il Principe* of Machiavelli are so far the most we have had from him. However, he carried on the "Cambridge Modern History" until failing health compelled him to leave it to others, and it is said that he had been collecting for years material for a general history of civil and religious liberty in Europe. He preferred to know, to absorb rather than write; and by vast reading and a marvelous memory he came to be possibly the most erudite historical student of his day. At the same time he kept details in a large perspective; his fastidious accuracy and passion for completeness might otherwise have savored of pedantry. Thus equipped, he influenced others especially by association and example, his knowledge and counsel being much sought and freely given.

From Germany and Austria comes report of the death of Professor Ihne, author of the *Roman History*; Dr. Julius Köstlin, biographer of Luther; Pastor Tollin, author of studies on the Huguenots and on Servetus; Wilhelm Martens, church historian; Dr. Adolph Beer, who worked particularly in Austrian history of the later eighteenth century; and Dr. Max Büdinger, writer of the Ranke school and in many fields. Also,

from Belgium the death is announced of M. A. Motte, professor in the University of Gand, and student particularly of ancient history and of the religious wars; and from Russia, of Professor Karl Tigerstedt, of the University of Helsingfors, who occupied himself mainly with the history of Finland.

Dr. Henry A. Sill and Dr. Ralph C. H. Catterall have been appointed assistant professors at Cornell, the former to be in charge of ancient history and the latter of modern European history. Dr. Catterall, however, will not take up his work until another year.

Dr. Norman M. Trenholme, of Pennsylvania State College, has been given charge of the work in history at the University of Missouri, with the position of assistant professor. Dr. Jonas Viles goes to the same institution as instructor.

Dr. J. H. Latané, hitherto professor in Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, has become professor at Washington and Lee University.

After all, the International Congress for the Historical Sciences may yet be realized. Dr. Nasi, Italian Minister of Education, Prince Colonna, Mayor of Rome, and Dr. Gorrini, Director of the Archives, as representatives of the committee in charge, announce that the congress will meet in Rome next April.

In the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for June, M. Xénopol examines at length the second part of Rickert's recent work on "Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung, eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften" (Tübingen and Leipzig, Mohr), and M. Beer discusses Seignobos's "La Méthode Historique Appliquée aux Sciences Sociales."

In April appeared the first number of a periodical entitled *Politisch-anthropologische Revue*, the chief aim of which is "to make the principles of the evolutionary thinking which prevails in the natural sciences of more effect in reference to the social, political and *geistig* development of races and states." It is published monthly, at twelve marks, by L. Woltmann and H. Buhmann (Eisenach, Thüringische Verlagsanstalt).

The *Deutsche Monatschrift*, lately begun by I. Lohmeyer, has already presented several noteworthy articles, particularly: A. Kirchoff, *Das Meer im Leben der Völker und in der Machtstellung der Staaten* (in number 2); Th. Lindner, *Die Entwicklung des deutschen Nationalbewusstseins* (3); and O. Hintze, *Weltgeschichte und Weltpolitik* (5).

It will be of interest that the present Lord Acton has arranged to publish, with Messrs. Macmillan, his father's lectures as professor at Cambridge, one course of which related to the French Revolution and another to general modern history. In conjunction with a reprint of the inaugural lecture, they will form two volumes. It is hoped also, later on, to publish one or more volumes of essays.

Mr. Nelson Case, in an octavo of some four hundred and twenty pages, attempts to set forth the origin and development of the governments of modern Europe, from the fall of the western Roman empire to the close of the nineteenth century: *European Constitutional History* (Cincinnati, Jennings and Pye).

*Ten Thousand Miles in Persia*, by Major Sykes, besides being a record of travel in eastern and southern Iran contains considerable historical matter, especially with reference to the journeys of Alexander the Great and Marco Polo (London, Murray).

Mention may well be made here of *The Oxford History of Music*, which began to appear early this year. It will consist, when completed, of six volumes. Most histories of music are given especially to biography; this one is to show the continuous evolution of music: it will deal "with the art rather than the artist" (Clarendon Press). We note also the publication of *Music in the History of the Western Church*, by F. Dickinson, with an introduction on religious music among primitive and ancient peoples (New York, Scribners).

The new volumes of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* represent an endeavor to bring that work up to modern requirements; and the additions will be extensive, the third volume going only to "Eld." An index, too, is promised for the completed work—the ninth edition and the new volumes (London, A. and C. Black and the *Times*). We note also the publication of the second volume of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, covering the subject from "Apocrypha" to "Benash" (Funk and Wagnalls).

Mr. Jonathan Nield has served his fellows not unwell by tabulating several hundred historical novels according to the period in which their scenes are laid: *A Guide to the best Historical Novels and Tales* (Putnams). This list will no doubt supersede the one by Mr. H. C. Bowen, published some twenty years ago.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

The Clarendon Press has issued the first of a series of volumes on the history of Egypt until the Roman conquest: *History of Egypt from the end of the Neolithic Period to the Death of Cleopatra*, by E. A. W. Budge. Vol. I., *Egypt in the Neolithic and Archaic Periods*.

A late book by Mr. C. W. C. Oman treats of the Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, Cato, Pompey, and Cæsar: *Seven Roman Statesmen of the Later Republic*. It is intended "to show the importance of the personal element in those miserable days of storm and stress" (Longmans). Here also may be noted a fall announcement in the "Heroes of the Nations": *Augustus Cæsar, and the Organization of the Empire of Rome*, by Mr. J. B. Firth (Putnams).

The second volume of *Les Institutions juridiques des Romains*, by M. Édouard Cuq, appeared in the summer; it bears the sub-title: "Le Droit classique et le Droit du Bas-Empire" (Paris, Plon-Nourrit).



The *History of the Roman People* by Professor Charles Seignobos can now be used in American schools. The editor of the translation is Dr. William Fairley, who also adds five chapters on the period from Theodosius I. to Charlemagne (Henry Holt and Co.).

Noteworthy article: A. Bouché-Leclercq, *La Question d'Orient au Temps de Cicéron* (Revue Historique, July and September).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Announcement has been made, in the "Heroes of the Nations," of *Mediæval India under Mohammedan Rule*, by Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole (Putnams).

Professor Charles Seignobos's *Le Régime Féodal*, which forms the opening chapter of the second volume of the Lavisser-Rimbaud *Histoire Générale*, has been done into English under the editorship of Professor Earle W. Dow, and published in an octavo pamphlet of some seventy pages. If it is favorably received in this form it is designed to become one of a series of such publications, with the object of making more available some of the best treatments of specially important subjects in the field of general history (Henry Holt and Co.).

The second and third numbers of the "Opuscles de Critique Historique" relate, like the first, to St. Francis, and are both edited by M. Paul Sabatier: *Description du Manuscrit franciscain de Liegnitz (Silésie)*, and *S. Francisci Legendæ Veteris Fragmenta Quædam* (Paris, Fischbacher).

A noteworthy thesis was sustained recently before the Faculty of Letters at Paris by M. Eugene Déprez: *La Papauté, la France et l'Angleterre, 1328-1342*, a detailed study of the origins of the Hundred Years' War (Paris, Fontemoing). Also, M. Déprez plans to supplement this volume with three others, in which he will deal in like manner with the relations between the Papacy, France and England from the treaty of Paris to the peace of Bretigny (1259-1360).

Two notable additions have been made to the Dent-Macmillan "Mediæval Towns": *Prague*, by Count Lützow; and *Cairo*, by Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole.

The admirable text-book of medieval history written by M. Charles Bémont for the Monod series for French schools has just appeared in an English version, made under the editorship of Professor George B. Adams (Henry Holt and Co.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Enlart, *Une Colonie française du Moyen Age: le Royaume de Chypre* (Minerva, from August 1); C. Daux, *La Protection apostolique au Moyen Age* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

#### MODERN HISTORY.

The first volume of "The Cambridge Modern History" is announced for November. Under the general title of *The Renaissance*

are some twenty chapters by near as many writers. Dr. Henry C. Lea, for America, deals with "The Eve of the Reformation." The following list indicates the titles of the remaining volumes: II. The Reformation; III. Wars of Religion; IV. The Thirty Years' War; V. Bourbons and Stuarts; VI. The Eighteenth Century; VII. The United States; VIII. The French Revolution; IX. Napoleon; X. Restoration and Reaction; XI. The Growth of Nationalities; XII. The Latest Age. The successive volumes are to be published in two series, beginning respectively with Vol. I. and Vol. VII.; and it is hoped to issue two each year (The Macmillan Company).

Announcement has been made of a new series of special monographs devoted to the history and literature of the Italian Renaissance: *Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento*, edited by Signor F. P. Luiso. It will deal with special phases of Renaissance life and culture, with the less known of the humanists and with minor but significant figures in the history of the period. The first volumes on the list are Guido Mazzoni's translation of Munz's book on the precursors of the Renaissance, with additions by the author, and Schiaparelli's *La Casa Fiorentina nei Secoli XIV. et XV.* (Florence, Sansoni).

An English edition has been made of F. Kircheisen's bibliography of Napoleon, already issued in both German and French: *Bibliography of Napoleon* (London, Low). It appears from the preface to be a preparatory work, comprising a selection from some thirty thousand titles. By way of bibliographies in the field of modern history note may also be made of a *Repertorium der neueren Kriegsgeschichte, von \* \** (Oldenburg, G. Stalling). It, too, is a selection, prepared primarily for German officers.

*A History of the Nineteenth Century Year by Year*, by Edward Emerson, Jr. (P. F. Collier), which is designed "to group in moderate compass the central facts of each country's development during the past century in such a way as to make them easily accessible to the inquirer," will be published soon by Messrs. Dodd, Mead and Co. in a new edition.

In *Progress of South Africa in the Century* Dr. Theal practically gives a history of Africa south of the Zambesi from 1795 to 1899, or from the first English occupation of the Cape to the outbreak of the recent Boer war (London, Chambers).

The publication is begun of the diplomatic correspondence between France and Russia from 1814 to 1830, under the care of the president of the Imperial Historical Society of Russia, A. Polovtsoff: *Correspondance diplomatique des Ambassadeurs et Ministres de Russie en France et de France en Russie avec leurs Gouvernements*. Vol. I., 1814-1816 (Paris, L. Conard).

Messrs. Little, Brown and Co. are bringing out a new volume by Captain Mahan under the title *Retrospect and Prospect*. It contains essays on the development of political feeling and outlook in the United States

during the last decade, effect of the war in South Africa on the prestige of the British empire, motives to imperial federation, conditions influencing the distribution of navies, the relation of the Persian Gulf to world politics, and the military rule of obedience.

Among late publications upon contemporary history are : *Conquête de Madagascar (1895-1896)*, by J. Poirier (Paris, H. Charles-Lavauzelle); the third and concluding volume of H. Cordier's *Histoire des Relations de la Chine avec les Puissances Occidentales* (Paris, Alcan); the second volume of *The Times History of the War in South Africa*, by L. S. Amery, which is said to deserve almost unreserved praise (London, Low); *The Uganda Protectorate*, 2 vols., by Sir Harry Johnson (Dodd, Mead and Co.); *Asiatic Russia*, 2 vols., by Professor G. F. Wright, of Oberlin College (McClure, Philips and Co.); *Memoirs of Sir Edward Blount*, edited by Stuart J. Reid (Longmans); the American edition of Mr. Henry Norman's *All the Russias* (Scribners); and *Progress of India, Japan, and China in the Century*, by Sir Richard Temple, in "The Nineteenth Century Series" (London, Chambers).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals : P. S. Allen, *Hieronymus Balbus in Paris* (English Historical Review, July); H. Hüffer, *Der Feldzug der Engländer und Russen in Holland im Herbst 1799 und die Stellung Preussens*, II. (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, July); J. F. Chance, *The Baltic Expedition and Northern Treaties of 1715* (English Historical Review, July); Albert Sorel, *La Paix d'Amiens* (Revue des Deux-Mondes, from August 1); Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Printing of the Westminster Confession*, concluded (The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, July).

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

Late publications of the British government include the second volume of the *Calendar of the Close Rolls, Edward I., 1279-1288*, by W. H. Stevenson; the fifth volume of the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward III., 1343-1345*, by R. F. Isaacson; another of Mr. Pike's year-books of Edward III., *Year-Books of the Reign of Edward III. : Year XVII.*; a volume for 1577-1578 in the *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign*, by A. J. Butler; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1673*; and *Acts of the Privy Council*, Vol. XXV., relating to the period from October 1595 to June 1596.

The latest issue in Messrs. Goupil's richly illustrated series on the English sovereigns is *Henry VIII.*, by A. F. Pollard. Some of the criticism the book has had so far speaks better for its pictures than for its text.

The *Letters Received by the East India Company from its Servants in the East*, edited by W. Foster, has reached its sixth volume, which relates to the latter half of the year 1617 (London, Low).

Mr. Andrew Lang, with all his other writings, has found time to make a book on *James VI. and the Gowrie Conspiracy*. He believes he has demonstrated at least one point, the innocence of James VI. (Longmans).

The *South Atlantic Quarterly* for July has an article, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, on "Two New England Rulers of Madras." It treats of Elihu Yale, governor from 1687 to 1692, and of his successor, Nathaniel Higginson, who held office until 1698.

The letters of Monsieur César de Saussure to his family, giving the impression formed of England by an educated Frenchman during his stay there in 1725 to 1729, have been translated and edited by Madame van Muyden: *A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I. and George II.* (London, Murray).

A presentation of the main outlines of English history—a certain knowledge of the facts being presupposed—is the purport of a little volume by Miss Lucy Dale: *The Principles of English Constitutional History*, published in this country by Longmans, Green and Co.

Students of the history of English municipal institutions will note with pleasure, in the *English Historical Review* for July, the first part of a considerable study, by Miss Mary Bateson, entitled "A London Municipal Collection of the Reign of John." They will also be interested in the progress of the "Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London"; the latest volume contains Letter-Book D, which is mainly concerned with the years 1309-1314, and a detailed introduction by the editor, Dr. Sharpe.

The second issue in "The Historic Families" series—it will be recalled that the first dealt with the Douglasses—gives a record of the Percys: *A History of the House of Percy*, 2 vols., by Gerald Brennan (London, Freemantle).

Noteworthy article: C. H. Firth, *Cromwell and the Crown* (English Historical Review, July).

#### FRANCE.

It is announced that the *Répertoire Méthodique du Moyen Age français*, published for two years (1894 and 1895) by M. A. Vidier, is to be revived. It will cover in the next issue publications of 1901, will appear as formerly in connection with *Le Moyen Age*, and will be under the direction of M. R. Poupardin.

The fifth volume of the *Catalogue des Manuscrits Français*, recently issued, with a preface by M. Léopold Delisle, completes the inventory of the old body of French manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. A general alphabetical index of the work will appear in due time (Paris, Firmin-Didot).

The status of studies relating to the economic history of France in the Middle Ages is the subject of an excellent article by M. P. Boissonnade in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for June: "Les Études Relatives à l'Histoire Économique de la France au Moyen Age."

The publishers have distributed the first fascicle of the *Lettres Secrètes et Curiales du Pape Urbain V se rapportant à la France*, drawn from the registers in the Vatican by P. Lecacheux. There will be five

fascicles in all ; three of text, one for introduction and tables, and one for an analytical table of the pieces in registers that do not relate to France (Paris, Fontemoing).

*Louis XIII d'après sa Correspondance avec le Cardinal de Richelieu (1622-1642)*, by the Comte de Beauchamp, claims to show the King in a new light ; making him a healthy, robust man who occupied himself personally with the administration of the kingdom and considered Richelieu as his best collaborator (Paris, Renouard).

*Mémoires des Evêques de France sur la Conduite à tenir à l'Égard des Réformés (1698)* is the first volume in the "Archives de l'Histoire Religieuse de la France." It will be recalled that this series, announced some time ago, will aim to provide a collection of documents of capital interest for the history of beliefs, ideas, customs and social and political life in France (Paris, Picard).

M. Ch. Gomel continues his studies of the financial history of the French Revolution, his latest volume bearing the title *Histoire financière de la Législative et de la Convention, I.: 1792-1793* (Paris, Guillaumin).

*L'État actuel des Études d'Histoire Moderne en France*, the report which MM. Caron and Sagnac drew up for the expected historical congress at Rome, contains a sketch of organization of work, with reference to centers of production, forms of production, and bibliographical equipment ; a somewhat longer account of what is now being done and what there is yet to do ; and a brief characterization of the work of present French historians in the modern field. It would be well to have such reports for other countries also, and for the earlier as well as the later periods. An intelligent invoice of the general situation cannot be less than interesting to all, and to the great majority of students it is positively instructive (Paris, Société nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition).

The *Répertoire méthodique de l'Histoire moderne et contemporaine de la France pour l'Année 1900*, by MM. Brière and Caron, was sent out in the summer. Its increasing usefulness is indicated in part by the fact that the number of titles has risen from 2038 the first year and 3638 the second to 4347. Also the plan of classification is considerably changed ; chiefly, the publications formerly listed under "Histoire par Époques" are now distributed between "Histoire Politique Intérieure," "Histoire Diplomatique" and "Histoire Militaire" (Paris, Société nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition). It will be welcome, in this connection, that the authors of this *Répertoire* have been charged by the Société d'Histoire Moderne with the preparation of a bibliography of the history of France from 1789 to the present time. This bibliography will comprise two volumes, one devoted to sources and the other to "travaux" ; and if it is favorably received, attention will be given to the period from 1500 to 1789. It may be added that the society has in view other bibliographies of the same kind.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. See, *Les Idées politiques au Temps de la Fronde* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, May-September); Alfred Bourget, *Le Duc de Choiseul et la Hollande*, I. (Revue Historique, July); F. des Robert, *Le Marquis de Dangeau et le Palatin, 1672-1673* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); M. Marion, *Un Épisode du Mouvement de 1789 à Bordeaux, d'après un Document Inédit* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, May-September); A. de Ganniers, *Les Écoles militaires en France sous la Révolution* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

#### ITALY, SPAIN.

Two important additions have been made this year to the Villari historical series: *L'Imperatore Giuliano l'Apostata*, by G. Negri, and *L'Epoca delle Grandi Scoperte Geografiche*, by Professor Errera, of Turin, (Milan, Hoepli).

Mr. R. M. Johnston sends us word of his discovery of a copy of the memoirs of Queen Mary Caroline, a manuscript which he describes as especially informing upon the Queen's relations with Lord William Bentinck; as dealing at length with the years 1805 to 1814; and as containing in an appendix copies of a large number of documents, many unpublished, some of importance. It appears in this connection that Mr. Johnston is engaged upon a history of Naples from 1805 to 1821.

Students of the "Risorgimento" welcome the publication of Volume III. of Arbib's important *Cinquant Anni di Storia Parlamentare del Regno d'Italia* (Rome, Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati, 1902). This volume covers the years 1863-1870; other volumes are in preparation. It is to be regretted that the writer holds so closely to the analytical method in his account of the parliamentary discussions. An occasional sympathetic view of Italian political thought, as expressed by the representatives of the nation, would have added much to the value of the work.

De Fellissent's *Il Generale Pianell e il suo Tempo* (Verona, Drucker, 1902) is a biography, properly so called, and the only such book yet written upon that able and prominent Italian general. It is of considerably less interest, however, than Pianell's own *Lettere e Ricordi Familiari* (Naples), published a year ago by his widow.

Spanish historical publications of the past year include notably, in the matter of sources, two new volumes (IV. and V.) of *Cortes de los Antiguos Reinos de Aragón y Valencia y Principado de Cataluña*, containing acts of the Catalan Cortes for the years 1377-1410; the twentieth volume of *Actas de las Cortes de Castilla*, comprising documents of the years 1602-1604; and three additions to the *Monumenta Societatis Jesu*: "Epistolæ P. Nadal," "Epistolæ Mixtæ," and "Monumenta Pædagogica."

Among the new books relating to the general history of Spain are *La Moneda Castellana*, by Señor Vives; *Don Juan de Austria en Flán-*



des, by Señor Barado; and *Los Moriscos Españoles y su Expulsión*, in two volumes by Señor Boronat. In the local field mention may be made especially of a history of the villains of Catalonia, by Señor Hinojosa; *Origen y Vicisitudes de la Pajesia de remensa en Cataluña*.

Announcement has been made of a three-volume history of protestantism and the inquisition in Spain during the sixteenth century: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus und der Inquisition im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, by Dr. Ernst Schäfer. The second and third volumes are to contain documents, drawn mainly from the archives in Madrid and Simancas (Gutersloh, Bertelsmann).

Noteworthy article: G. Desdevises du Dezert, *Le Conseil de Castille au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, conclusion (*Revue Historique*, July).

#### GERMANY.

An English and a French diagnosis of modern Germany have appeared about the same time; *German Empire of To-day*, by Veritas (Longmans); and *L'Impérialisme Allemand*, by Maurice Lair (Paris, Colin).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Richard Fester, *Sleidan, Sabinus, Melancthon* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXIX., 1); Louis Paul-Dubois, *Frédéric le Grand, d'après sa Correspondance politique* (*Revue des Deux-Mondes* from July 1); Friedrich Meinecke, *Friedrich Wilhelm IV. und Deutschland* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXIX., 1); Otto Bremer, *Politische Geschichte und Sprachgeschichte* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, July); Hermann Bloch, *Paul Scheffer-Boichorst* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXIX., 1).

#### BELGIUM.

The second volume of Professor Pirenne's *Histoire de Belgique*, lately published, goes to the death of Charles the Bold in 1477. By agreement it appeared first in a German translation, in the "Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten" (Gotha, Perthes).

The Belgian Royal Historical Commission has lately brought out a short but important contribution to the economic history of the Netherlands: *Documents pour servir à l'Histoire des Prix, de 1381 à 1784*, by M. H. Van Houtte (Brussels, Kiessling).

#### AMERICA.

We have the pleasure of announcing that practically all arrangements have been made for the publication, by Messrs. Harper and Brothers, of a co-operative history of the United States, edited by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart. This work will comprise twenty-six volumes, grouped under the general title *The American Nation. A History from Original Material by Associated Scholars*. Each volume will have about three hundred pages, and besides the text will contain some illustrative matter, a few maps, a chapter of critical bibliography, and an index. There will also be a general index, forming a separate volume. The period covered will be from the discovery to the present day; the

geographical field, that part of North America which is now the United States; and personal, social and economic factors are to enter in, as well as political. The divisions of the work will be chronological; "the log shall be sawed into sections, not split into rails." According to the proposed plan, the several sections have been grouped and named and distributed to writers as follows: *Group I.—Foundations of the Nation.* 1. European Background of American History (XV.—XVI. Centuries). Professor E. P. Cheyney. 2. American Conditions of American History (XV.—XIX. Centuries). Mr. W J McGee. 3. Spain in America (1450–1580). Professor E. G. Bourne. 4. England in America (1580–1652). President L. G. Tyler. 5. Self-Governed Colonization (1652–1689). Professor Charles M. Andrews. *Group II.—Transformation into a Nation.* 6. A Half-Century of Commonwealth Building (1690–1740). Professor E. B. Greene. 7. The French and the English (1750–1763). Mr. R. G. Thwaites. 8. Preliminaries of the Revolution (1763–1776). Professor George E. Howard. 9. The Revolution (1776–1789). 10. Constitution Building (1781–1789). Professor A. C. McLaughlin. *Group III.—Development of the Nation.* 11. The Federalist System (1789–1801). Professor McLaughlin. 12. The Republican System (1801–1811). Professor Edward Channing. 13. The Nation Finds Itself (1811–1819). Professor K. C. Babcock. 14. The New West (1819–1829). Professor F. J. Turner. 15. The New Democracy (1829–1837). Professor William McDonald. *Group IV.—Trial of Nationality.* 16. Elements of the Slavery Contest (1834–1841). Professor Hart. 17. Westward Extension (1841–1850). Professor George P. Garrison. 18. Politics and Slavery (1851–1859). Professor T. C. Smith. 19. Elements of the Civil War (1859–1861). Mr. W. G. Brown. 20. The Appeal to Arms (1861–1863). Mr. J. K. Hosmer. 21. Outcome of the Civil War (1863–1866). Mr. Hosmer. *Group V.—National Expansion.* 22. Reconstruction, Political and Economic (1866–1877). Professor W. A. Dunning. 23. New Foundations for National Life (1877–1885). 24. Problems of the Wealthy Republic (1885–1897). Mr. W. C. Ford. 25. America the World Power (1898–1905). Professor J. H. Latané. 26. Ideals of American Government (1870–1905). Professor Hart.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers are issuing this fall *A History of the American People*, in five volumes, by President Woodrow Wilson. The first three hundred and fifty impressions will form a "limited alumni edition," offered to alumni of such colleges as have known Dr. Wilson as an instructor or have honored him with a degree.

Two volumes of essays left ready for the press by Mr. John Fiske are being published this autumn by the Macmillan Company, under the title *Essays: Historical and Literary*. They refer mainly to prominent characters in American history.

Students of the period of discovery will note with interest a new book by Henry Vignaud, First Secretary of our Legation at Paris: *Toscanelli*

and Columbus: the Letter and Chart of Toscanelli on the Route to the Indies by way of the West, sent in 1474 to the Portuguese Fernam Martins, and later on to Christopher Columbus. It is a critical study on the authenticity and value of these documents and the sources of the cosmographical ideas of Columbus, and also contains the various texts of the letter, with translations, annotations, several facsimiles, and a map (London, Sands). Of the same bearing is an article in the *Compte Rendu du Congrès International des Américanistes*, held in September, 1900: "La Solution de tous les Problèmes relatifs à Christophe Colomb et en particulier de celui des Origines ou des prétendus Inspirateurs de la Découverte du Nouveau Monde," by M. Gonzalez de la Rosa.

The Putnams have in preparation a three-volume history of Christopher Columbus, by John Boyd Thatcher. One object in view is to put before the reader the information that was accessible at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries; wherefore old manuscripts, charts and accounts are reproduced in full. Also, an investigation is made of the disputes and discussions of recent years.

Messrs. Appleton have published the first number of "Appleton's Life Histories," *Father Marquette, the Explorer of the Mississippi*, by Mr. R. G. Thwaites. The next volume announced in this series is *Daniel Boone*, also by Mr. Thwaites.

A handsome new edition has been issued of the *History and General Description of New France*, the work of Charlevoix as translated by the late Dr. J. G. Shea, with a new memoir and bibliography of the translator by Noah F. Morrison, all in six volumes (London, Edwards).

The Burrows Brothers Company, of Cleveland, is publishing a series of reprints of historical and bibliographical importance, beginning with Denton's *A Brief Description of New York, formerly called New Netherlands*, from the original edition of 1670 in the Library of Congress, and with a bibliography by Felix Neumann. Other numbers announced are Wooley's *Journal during Two Years' Residence in New York*, edited by Professor E. G. Bourne; Miller's *Description of New York*, Budd's *Good Order in Pennsylvania*, Alsop's *A Character of the Province of Maryland*; and Ferdinand Columbus's life of his father, Christopher Columbus, prepared by Professor Bourne.

Two recent books dealing with colonial government appear to contain matter of interest to students of American history: *Colonial Government: An Introduction to the Study of Colonial Institutions*, by Paul S. Reinsch (Macmillan); and *The Administration of Dependencies*, a study, from the legal side, of the evolution of the federal empire, with special reference to American colonial problems, by A. H. Snow (Putnams).

Several books of an educational order have been published lately or are announced to appear soon. We note: *American Politics*, by Professor J. A. Woodburn (Putnams); *American Constitutional History*, by Alexander Johnston, edited from Lalor by Professor Woodburn; *Source*

*Readers in American History.* No. 1, *Colonial Children*, selected and annotated by Professor A. B. Hart, with the collaboration of Miss Blanche E. Hazard (Macmillan); *Studies in United States History*, a guide for the use of students and teachers, by Sara M. Riggs (Ginn and Co.).

It is said that Mr. Paul Leicester Ford was at work, at the time of his death, upon an extensively annotated edition of Weems's *Washington*, and that he had it so far along that it is possible to complete it.

In a letter in the New York *Evening Post* of August 14, Dr. Herbert Friedenwald gives some new information in regard to the date of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Elbridge Gerry wrote Samuel and John Adams from Kingsbridge, July 21: "Pray subscribe for me the Declaration of Independency, if the same is to be signed as proposed. I think we ought to have the privilege, when necessarily absent, of voting and signing by proxy." Moreover, assuming that August 2 was the date of the general signing, Gerry must be classed with Thornton and McKean as a later signer; since he did not return to Philadelphia until September 1, and since his "signature, like McKean's, comes at the end of the delegation from his State and is somewhat crowded in."

The United States Catholic Historical Society has published, as the first number in a series of "Monographs," *Unpublished Letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and of his Father, Charles Carroll of Doughoregan*, compiled and edited, with a memoir, by T. Meagher Field.

The Reverend A. M. Sherman enters considerably into the Revolutionary War in *The Life of Captain Jeremiah O'Brien of Machias, Me.* Former secretary John D. Long contributes the introduction (Lynbrook, New York, G. W. Sherman).

*The Loyalists of the American Revolution*, by Dr. C. H. VanTyne, Senior Fellow in the University of Pennsylvania, will be published this autumn. A history of the political and social struggle between the American Whigs and Tories, it treats a relatively neglected side of the Revolution, and especially from material hitherto not used (Macmillan).

Mr. D. H. Chamberlain read before the Massachusetts Historical Society, at its May meeting, a valuable paper on "The Historical Conception of the United States Constitution and Union," in which he examined a dictum by Mr. Goldwin Smith and a statement of Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, to the effect that at the beginning every one supposed that a state could at any time peaceably and legally withdraw from the Union. Mr. Chamberlain does not simply plead the general issue and leave the affirmative to its proofs—which might indeed have been sufficient. He examines the material and lays down in his turn the positive statement that "there was not a man in the country who thought or claimed that the new system was anything but a perpetual Union."

*The Rise of Commercial Banking Institutions in the United States* is the title of a doctoral dissertation prepared by Adolph Oscar Eliason, of the University of Minnesota. The study is almost altogether confined to the period preceding the formation of the First Bank of the United States. The tardy rise of banking institutions is attributed to the peculiar condition of the colonial trade, to which the author gives some attention as the foundation of his thesis.

We have received the second annual number of the John P. Branch *Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College*, edited by Professor William E. Dodd. It contains especially: "The Whiskey Insurrection in Pennsylvania and the Opinions of Contemporary Party Leaders Concerning its Suppression," by B. W. Bond, Jr.; another portion of the "Correspondence of Leven-Powell," comprising letters of the years 1775-1787 which bear upon the Revolutionary War and the settlement of Kentucky and its separation from Virginia; "Letters bearing on the War of 1812"; and "Letters of Thomas Ritchie—Glimpses of the Year 1830." The publication of such material should accomplish even more than the object avowed by the editor, which is "to stimulate and encourage the study and writing of history in Randolph-Macon College."

The leading article of the July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly* is "A Diary Kept by Dr. Robert Wellford, of Fredericksburg, Virginia, during the March of the Virginia Troops to Fort Pitt (Pittsburg) to Suppress the Whiskey Insurrection."

We note the following publications of interest to students of American church history: *Methodist Episcopal Church in America*, being the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America as contained in its disciplines from 1788 to 1808, compiled and edited with an historical introduction by J. I. Tigert, D.D. (Cincinnati, Jennings and Pye); and *A History and Record of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of West Virginia, and, before the Formation of the Diocese in 1878, in the Territory now known as the State of West Virginia*, by G. W. Peterkin (Charleston, West Virginia, the Tribune Company).

Upon the proposition of Mr. Adolph Moses, of the Chicago Bar, followed by the action of the Chicago and the American Bar Associations, the fourth of February, 1901, being the hundredth anniversary of the day that John Marshall took his seat in the Supreme Court of the United States, was celebrated in all parts of the country as John Marshall Day. The proceedings held in Chicago on that occasion, and those before the Supreme Court of Illinois, have been published, in handsome form, by the associated committees in charge of the celebration. Among the many items we may mention especially "The Centennial Oration," by Henry Cabot Lodge.

The June and July *Bulletins* of the New York Public Library give the fourth and fifth installments of letters of James Monroe. They belong to the years 1812-1817 and 1820-1823.

The documents printed in the June and July *Bulletins* of the Boston Public Library consist of letters bearing mainly on the politics of the fourth and fifth decades of the last century; with two exceptions they belong to the years 1828-1848. Those in the August and September numbers are of earlier date, 1674-1770. Besides letters they include, among other pieces: an action of the Privy Council on petition of John Usher, treasurer and receiver general of New England (1689); a committee report in reference to the Boston Free Grammar School, in 1710; and a deposition concerning the impressment of one Edward Maylem.

The second volume of the *Political History of the United States; with Special Reference to the Growth of Political Parties*, by J. P. Gordy, was published in the summer. It presents its facts with a view toward two conclusions: "That unwise financial legislation was primarily responsible for the dangerous position of the country at the close of the War of 1812, and that public opinion of the North with reference to the negro prior to 1830 differed but little from that of the South; the greater readiness to free him in the former section having been due to the fact that if freed he would live in the South" (Henry Holt and Co.).

Lincoln and General Sherman are portrayed in two late issues of the "Biographies of Famous Men," the former by Joseph H. Barrett and the latter by W. F. Johnson (Chicago, M. A. Donohue and Co.). Also, apropos of Lincoln, the Century Company will publish a condensed edition, prepared by the late John G. Nicolay, of the Nicolay-Hay life, designed to contain all the essential facts of the ten-volume edition.

Among new books bearing on the Civil War are *The first New York (Lincoln) Cavalry from April, 1861, to July 7, 1865*, by W. H. Beach (Milwaukee, C. N. Caspar Co.); *History of the Sixty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, 1862-1865*, with a sketch of E. A. King's brigade, Reynold's division, Thomas's corps, in the battle of Chickamauga, by Edwin W. High (Metamora, Indiana, by the author).

Among the most interesting of the fall announcements is Dr. Edward Everett Hale's *Memories of a Hundred Years* (Macmillan).

*The Founders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*, by Sarah Saunders Smith, is published as "a careful research of the earliest records of many of the foremost settlers of the New England Colony, compiled from the earliest church and state records" (Washington, Woodward and Lothrop).

The last numbers (9 and 10) have been published of Mr. W. W. Tooker's Algonquian series of *Researches Relating to the Early Indians of New York and New England* (New York, F. P. Harper).

The history of Long Island forms the subject of an illustrated three-volume work by P. Ross: *A History of Long Island, from its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York and Chicago, Lewis Publishing Co.).



*The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for July opens with the first part of "Joseph Galloway, the Loyalist Politician," by Dr. Ernest H. Baldwin. In addition it continues "William Biles," "The Society of the Sons of Saint Tammany of Philadelphia," "Life of Margaret Shippen, Wife of Benedict Arnold," and concludes "Popp's Journal, 1777-1783," "Dean Tucker's Pamphlet," "Memoirs of Brigadier-General John Lacey, of Pennsylvania," and "Letters of Presidents of the United States and 'Ladies of the White House.'"

The lists of the faithful published for a number of years in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* are to be continued by sacramental registers of marriages and baptisms. A beginning of these is made in the June number, with that part of the registers at St. Augustine's Church, Philadelphia, that refers to the opening years of the last century.

A list of certificates of removal received at Philadelphia monthly meetings of Friends from 1682 to 1750 has been prepared by Mr. Albert Cook Myers: *Quaker Arrivals at Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, Ferris and Leach).

*The Publications of the Southern History Association* continues the "Journal of Charles Porterfield" (May and July numbers); and has also, among other articles: "An Old Time merchant in South Carolina," being a digest of correspondence of William Murrell in the ten years beginning with April, 1795, by Kate Furman (May); "Southern Political Views, 1865" (March and May numbers) and "An Account of the Organization and Operations of the Postoffice Department of the Confederate States of America, 1861 to 1865" (July number), by John H. Reagan; and "Diary of a Texas March," kept by W. H. C. Whiting in 1849, when he was engaged in laying out a military road from San Antonio to El Paso (begun in the July number).

*The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for July contains especially further parts of "Virginia Legislative Documents"; "The Germans of the Valley" (begun in the April number), by John Walter Wayland; "An Abridgement of the Laws of Virginia"; "Henry County Records"; and the first installment of the "John Brown Letters."

In the fourth volume (to be published soon) of his *History of South Carolina*, Dr. Edward McCrady covers the years 1780-1883, treating especially Greene's campaign in the South. He thus fulfils his purpose "to trace the history and development of the State of South Carolina socially and politically from the inception of the colony to the end of the American Revolution" (Macmillan).

Students of Southern history will welcome *The Gulf States Historical Magazine*, published at Montgomery, Alabama. It is to be a bi-monthly of sixty-four to one hundred pages, and will be devoted particularly to the history, literature and antiquities of the Gulf states. It proposes to print

historical papers, documents, genealogies and genealogical notes, short articles on minor topics, news, notes and queries, book notes and reviews, and pertinent illustrations. The editor is one of its owners, Thomas M. Owen, Director of the Department of Archives and History for the State of Alabama, and Secretary of the Alabama Historical Society. The first number, which bears the date of July, 1902, contains chiefly "The Beginnings of French Settlement of the Mississippi Valley," by P. J. Hamilton; "John Adair's Observations on Men and Affairs in the Old Southwest, 1809," with notes by R. T. Durrett; "Reminiscences of a Long Life," by Barnard Shipp; and "The Tragedy of the Commissariat," by J. W. DuBose.

Number 4 of the current series of "Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science" embodies "an effort to trace the development of the public highways of Alabama and to point out their influence upon immigration and settlement": *Internal Improvements in Alabama*, by W. E. Martin (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press).

In the July number of the *Quarterly of the Texas Historical Association* Mr. R. C. Clark continues his studies in early Texas history, writing this time upon "Louis Juchereau de Saint-Denis and the Re-establishment of the Tejas Missions"; and Mr. I. J. Cox, fellow in American history at the University of Pennsylvania, treats of "Educational Efforts in San Fernando de Bexar."

"Un Saintongeais Missionnaire chez les Illinois; Gabriel Richard (1769-1832)," by L. Grasilier, appeared in the *Revue de Saintonge et d'Aunis*, for May, 1902. Richard was at one time Delegate in Congress from the territory of Michigan.

The July number of the *Annals of Iowa* gives the concluding portion of Dr. Herriott's "Chapters in Iowa's Financial History," and has besides, among other matter, "The Flood of 1851," by Tacitus Hussey.

The seventh volume of the *Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society* contains a number of addresses and papers, most of them recollections referring either to the slavery struggle in Kansas or to the trials of the early frontier life. The paper of most general and permanent value is probably one on the "Sources of the Constitution of Kansas," by Miss Rosa M. Purdue.

Two important books on Mormon history appeared in the course of the summer: *The Story of the Mormons, from the Date of their Origin to the Year 1901*, by W. Alexander Linn (Macmillan); and *The Founder of Mormonism* by I. W. Riley, with an introduction by Professor G. T. Ladd, of Yale (Dodd, Mead and Co.).

In the June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, M. C. Gerge writes upon the "Political History of Oregon from 1876 to 1895"; Francis Fuller Victor gives a sketch of the First Oregon Cavalry; and H. S. Lyman contributes "Recollections of Horace Hol-

den," which relates Mr. Holden's reminiscences in regard to his adventures in the Pacific Ocean, among the cannibals of Polynesia, some seventy years ago.

"The Alaska-Canadian Frontier," by T. W. Balch, is reprinted from the *Journal of the Franklin Institute*. It reviews the history of the line between Alaska and the British possessions, together with the negotiations between America and Great Britain, since 1825, in regard to it, and concludes in favor of the American contention. There are eight maps (Philadelphia, Allen, Lane and Scott).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Don C. Barrett, *The Supposed Necessity of the Legal Tender Paper* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, May); H. Morse Stephens, *Some Living American Historians* (The World's Work, July).